THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

DEC 4 198

1929
508

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

LIBRARY OF
United Theological Seminary
E965
T582 55,566

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY

JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITED BY

A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.

AND

REV. E. HASTINGS, M.A.

VOLUME THE THIRTY-NINTH.

OCTOBER 1927 – SEPTEMBER 1928.

EDINBURGH:
T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET.

EDINBURGH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY LIBRARY

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED,
FOR
T. & T. CLARK, EDINBURGH.

LONDON . . SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT, AND CO. LIMITED.
MANCHESTER . . JOHN HEYWOOD.
EDINBURGH . . JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
GLASGOW . . JOHN MENZIES AND CO.
NEW YORK . . CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.

CONTENTS OF VOL. XXXIX.

AUTHORS.

Rev. H. W. C. Ainley— PAGE
The Nestle Greek New Testament . . 429
Rev. R. P. Ashe, M.A.—
Romans $12^{13.14}$ 46
Rev. D. M. Baillie, M.A.—
The Sermon on the Mount (Mt 6^{19-34}) . 443
Rev. W. Bartlett, M.A.—
St. Paul and the Twelve 39
Rev. A. D. Belden, B.D.—
Vital Values of the Cross 327
Rev. T. W. Bevan—
The Four Anointings 137
Rev. Canon A. W. F. Blunt, M.A., B.D.—
The Sermon on the Mount—Prayer. . 545
Rev. F. J. Briggs—
Ephesians $4^{20.21}$ 526
J. Davies Bryan—
A Silent East Wind 332
Rev. R. A. Burrows, M.A., B.D.—
Virginibus Puerisque 415
Rev. A. T. Cadoux, B.A., D.D.—
The Resurrection Appearances of Jesus . 504
Maurice A. Canney, M.A.—
Berākah 381
Rev. H. C. Carter, M.A.—
The Education of Jesus 562
Rev. W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D.—
Was St. Paul a Stammerer? . . . 458
Rev. John W. Clayton—
Who was the Rich Young Ruler? . . 83
The Rich Young Ruler 283
J. E. Compton—
'A Good Man' 189
Rev. W. E. P. Cotter—
St. Paul's Eucharist 235
Professor Samuel Daiches, Ph.D.—
The Meaning of עֵרָה in Leviticus 5^{8} . . 426
Rev. Edgar P. Dickie, M.C., B.D., B.A.—
Leaders of Theological Thought—Karl Heim 150
Rev. John Douglas, M.A.—
Implications of the Fatherhood of God . 275
Rev. R. Dunkerley, B.A., B.D., Ph.D.—
The Muhammadan Agrapha . . 167, 230
The Gospel according to the Hebrews 437, 490
Rev. H. J. Flowers, B.D.—
Adoption and Redemption in the Beloved 16

Principal A. E. Garvie, D.D.— PAGE
Recent Foreign Theology . . . 37, 262
Rev. R. C. Gillie, M.A., D.C.L.—
Prophetic Vocation 311
Rev. T. Crouther Gordon, D.F.C., B.D.—
Virginibus Puerisque 218, 555
Rev. A. J. Gossip, M.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque . . 22, 72, 174, 507
The Sermon on the Mount—The New Righteousness 342
Most Rev. John A. F. Gregg, D.D.—
'Therefore . . . because' (διὰ τοῦτο ὅτι) and Parallel Uses 308
Edward Grubb, M.A.—
'Individualistic' Interpretations . . 79
The Meaning of 'Salvation' . . . 44
J. Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D., D.D.—
The Shepherd of Hermas in the West 259
A New Witness for a Famous Western Reading 380
A Lost Verse in the Gospel of Mark. . 456
Two Remarkable Glosses in the Text of Hebrews 550
Rev. P. L. Hedley, M.A., B.D.—
'The Mote and the Beam' and 'The Gates of Hades' 427
Rev. F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D.—
Latinity of the Pastorals 347
Rev. F. C. Hoggarth—
Virginibus Puerisque 366
Rev. J. Ebenezer Howard—
Acts 1^{11} 92
Venerable J. W. Hunkin—
1 Corinthians 15^{32} 281
Rev. George L. Hurst—
The Voice out of the Whirlwind . . 137
Rev. J. W. Jack, M.A.—
New Light on Palestine 329
Rev. A. Gordon James—
Jesus our Advocate 473
Rev. D. John, B.A.—
St. Paul and Empedocles 237
Eleanor Anglin Johnson—
St. Paul's Infirmity 428
Rev. J. Kennedy, B.D.—
Virginibus Puerisque 23

UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DEC 4 1962

W. H. A. Learoyd, B.A.— PAGE
An Emendation of Psalm 82[7] . . . 382
Rev. J. P. Lilley, D.D.—
The New Church Hymnary: Two Companion Handbooks 282
Herbert Loewe, M.A.—
The Jewish Background to the Christian Liturgy 65
The Sacramental Controversy before A.D.1 198
Rev. Innes Logan, M.A., B.D.—
The Decree of Acts 15 428
Rev. Ernest G. Loosley, B.D.—
Virginibus Puerisque 122
Professor J. E. McFadyen, D.D.—
The Revised Edition of Sir George Adam Smith's Exposition of the Book of Isaiah 225
A German Estimate of Contemporary British Theology 411
Recent Foreign Theology . . . 471, 520
Professor J. F. McFadyen, D.D.—
Recent Foreign Theology 37
Professor W. M. Macgregor, D.D.—
The Sermon on the Mount—The Beatitudes 293
Rev. Albert G. Mackinnon, D.D.—
Surprises in the Early Church in Rome . 185
Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.D.—
Leaders of Theological Thought—Karl Barth 536
Recent Foreign Theology . . . 38, 261
Rev. G. W. M. MacLeavy—
Methodists and Moravians 92
Professor D. S. Margoliouth, D.Litt.—
Christ's Answer to the Question about Divorce 273
Rev. H. S. Marshall—
The Parable of the Untrustworthy Steward 120
Rev. Albert J. Matthews—
The Mustard 'Tree' 32
Rev. William J. May—
Virginibus Puerisque 316, 461
Geo. B. Michell—
The Chaldæans 45
Rev. W. D. Morris—
1 Corinthians 11[10] 139
Professor W. D. Niven, M.A.—
Montanism: Living Issues for To-day . 101
Rev. F. W. Norwood, D.D.—
The Sermon on the Mount (Mt 6[1-18]) . 408
Professor A. S. Peake, D.D.—
Commentaries on the Old and New Testaments . . . 245, 297, 361, 389
Rev. S. P. T. Prideaux, D.D.— PAGE
A Plea for the Study of Theology . . 394
Rev. James Reid, M.A.—
The Sermon on the Mount—Judgment of Others (Mt 7[1-5]) 486
Rev. A. T. Richardson—
Time-Measures of the Pentateuch . . 515
D. S. Robertson—
James 3[6] 333
Rev. G. Philip Robertson, M.A.—
Note on Luke 2[49] 235
Rev. Stuart Robertson, M.A.—
Virginibus Puerisque . 71, 122, 175, 217, 265, 314, 365, 414, 460, 508, 554
Principal H. Wheeler Robinson, D.D.—
The Holy Spirit in the Bible . . . 4
Rev. James Robson, M.A.—
Psalm 1[2] 90
Rev. William Ross, B.D.—
An Address to Divinity Students . . 35
Three in One, One in Three: A Study . 378
H. H. Rowley—
'The Chaldæans' 188
Hugh Schonfield—
Floor (Mt 8[20]) 332
Rev. Prebendary Melville Scott, D.D.—
Proverbs 19[23] 526
Professor J. A. Selbie, D.D.—
The American Translation of the Old Testament 171
Rev. Douglas S. Sharp, M.A., B.D.—
For our Justification 87
Rev. W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D.—
Our Lord's Teaching on the Kingdom of Heaven 214
Augustine's 'Soliloquies' 523
Rev. R. S. Sleigh, M.A., Ph.D.—
Recent Foreign Theology 521
Judah J. Slotki, B.A.—
The Origin of the Book of Job . . . 131
Rev. J. Steele, M.A., D.Lit.—
'The Unjust Steward' 236
Lieut.-Col. K. L. Stevenson—
The Origin of the Hebrews: A Suggestion 422
Rev. R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc.—
'Tears shall take comfort' 140
The Newer Estimate of Judaism . . 374
Rev. R. Strong, M.A., B.Litt.—
Virginibus Puerisque 266
Emeritus Principal J. G. Tasker, D.D.—
Recent Foreign Theology . . 86, 325, 470
Rev. R. E. Thomas, M.A.—
Ephesians 3[8] 283

Rev. Lewis Tucker, M.A.— PAGE
Praise in the Religious Life 134
Right Rev. Charles A. Webster, D.D.—
The Mote and the Beam 91
Professor A. C. Welch, D.D., D.Th.—
Recent Foreign Theology 262
Rev. F. B. Westbrook, B.A.—
Mark 10^{18} 331
Professor N. P. Williams, D.D.—
Present-Day Faiths—Anglo-Catholicism . 53
Rev. J. P. Wilson, B.D.— PAGE
1 Corinthians 11^{10} 283
William E. Wilson, B.D.—
The 'Servant' 136
The Relation of Sin and Death in Romans 5 476
Rev. J. A. Wood—
The Anointing at Bethany and its Significance 475
T. E. Young, B.A.—
The Cries upon the Cross 93

SUBJECTS.

PAGE
Adoption 17
Agrapha, Muhammadan. 167, 230
Amen-em-ope 97
American Translation of O.T. 171
Anglo-Catholicism . . . 53
Anointing at Bethany . . 475
Apostles, St. Paul and the Twelve 39
Argument from Design . . 436
Atonement . . . 21, 473
Augustine's 'Soliloquies' . 523
Authority in Religion . 51, 148
Barth, Karl 536
Beatitudes 293
Berākah 381
Bible, Reading of . . . 47
Chaldæans . . . 45, 188
Charity 421
Child, Religious Education of 242
Christ and Divorce . . . 273
,, Education . . . 562
,, our Hope . . . 78
,, Life-giver . . . 4
,, as Mediator . . . 145
,, Nature and Mission of 193
,, Reign of . . . 124
,, Resurrection Appearances of . . . 504
,, Temptation of . . 387
,, and Worry . . . 443
Christian Experience . . 481
,, Life 35
,, Literature . . 433
,, Liturgy, influenced by Jewish . . 65
Christianity . . . 100, 244
,, and Modern Outlook . . . 99
Christians 481
Church and the Child . . 242
,, Unity 143
Churches, Reunion of . . 485
Civilization, Influence on Native Life and Thought . 434
Commentaries . 245, 297, 361, 389
Conversion 528
Cries on the Cross . . . 93
Criticism of Churches . . 435
,, O.T. 146
Cross, Spirit of. . . . 481
,, Vital Values of . . 327
Day of Judgment . . . 241
Deutero-Isaiah 529
Deuteronomy, Date and Implications 291
Early Church in Rome, Surprises in 185
Education of Jesus . . . 562
Emotion in Religion . . 190
Ephesians, Epistle . . . 433
Expectation, Spirit of . . 128
Ezra 147
Failure 271
Faith 3
Falsehood in War-Time . 480
Fatherhood of God, Implications of 275
Fellowship 143
Foreign Theology . 37, 86, 261, 325, 470, 520
Gehazi 514
God, Compensations of . . 512
,, Difficulties of . . 468
,, in Nature . . . 338
,, Traditional Idea of . 435
Grace 268
Hades, Gates of . . . 427
Hebrew Influence . . 99, 147
Hebrews, Gospel according to . . . 437, 490
,, Origin of. . . 422
,, Two Remarkable Glosses. . . 550
Heim, Karl 150
Holy Spirit in the Bible . 4
,, ,, Dependence on . 481
,, ,, Gift of . . . 370
Immanence 435
Incarnation . . . 145, 436
Intellect and Faith . . . 368
Isaiah, Book of . . . 225
Israel, Religious Environment 97
Jacob and Israel . . . 223
Jesus our Advocate . . 473
,, as Life-giver . . . 4
,, Religion 244
Jewish Diaspora . . . 292
Job, Origin of Book . . 131
Judaism 147
,, Legacy of . . 194
,, Newer Estimate . 374
Judgment 126
,, of Others . . 486
Kingdom of Heaven . . 335
,, ,, Christ's Teaching ing on 214
,, ,, Realization of 482
Knowledge and Religion . 2
Last Supper 197
Lord Jesus Christ . . . 339
Magic in Israel. . . . 290
Mark's Gospel, Lost Verse in 456
Marx, Karl 482
Matthew's Gospel . . . 149
Methodists and Moravians . 92
Modern Outlook . . . 100
Modernism 193
Montanism 101
Moses, God of 291
Mote and Beam . . 91, 427
Mysticism 340
,, and Christianity . 342
,, and Religious Education. . . 478
Mystics 340
Old Testament 337
,, ,, American Translation . . 171
Palestine, New Light on . 328
Pantheism 341
Parable of the Mustard 'Tree,' 32
,, ,, Sheep and the Goats . . 241
,, ,, Unjust . . 236
,, ,, Untrustworthy Steward 120, 532
Past, Our Debt to . . . 194
Pastorals, Latinity of . . 347
Paul and Empedocles . . 237
,, Eucharist . . . 235
,, Infirmity of . . 428, 458
,, and the Twelve . . 39
Pauline Epistles . . . 433
Pentateuch, Time-Measures of 515
Personal Life, Value of . . 481
Personalities, O.T. . . . 339
Pharisaism 533
Piety, O.T. 291
Praise 134
Prayer 545
Prayer and Life . . . 93
Prayers 143
Preacher, Temptations of . 385

	PAGE
Preaching	95
Profession and Achievement	142
Prophetic Symbolism	290
,, Vocation	311
Psalms, Poetry of	292
Psycho-Therapy	189
Purity	556
Quakers	242
Resurrection-faith	387
Rich Young Ruler	83, 283
Righteousness	408
Roman Catholicism and Individualism	289
Sacerdotalist and Sacramental, Distinction between	1
Sacramental Controversy	198
Sacraments	1
Salvation	3, 79
Salvation by Grace	481
Scholar and Pew	51
,, and Pulpit	51
Schweitzer, Albert	256
Sermon on the Mount	49, 293, 342, 408, 443, 486, 545
Servant	136, 531
Shepherd of Hermas	259
Sin, Consciousness of	142
,, and Death	476
,, Sense of	383
Sincerity	383
Social Reform	96
Socialism	482
Spirit, Striving	47
Sunday School	243
Temptation of Christ	387
Tetragrammaton	290
Theology, German Estimate of British	
,, Plea for Study of	
'Therefore . . . because'	
Tree of Life	
Trinity	
Trust	
Truth	
Unjust Steward	
Virginibus Puerisque	22, 122, 174, 217, 265, 365, 414, 460, 507, 5
Von Hügel, Friedrich	
War	
Western Civilization criticised	
Wisdom Literatures	
Women and Holy Orders	
Word of God	

BOOKS.

	PAGE
Adventure	145
Anglo-American Preaching	527
Anthony, Relativity and Religion	207
Armytage, Christianity in the Roman World	116
Bacon, Story of Jesus	244, 249
Baikie, Glamour of Near East Excavation	113
Baillie, Faith in God	251
Baldwin, New England Clergy	451
Ballard, Twentieth-Century Christianity	209
Barclay, Protestant Doctrine of Lord's Supper	204
Barnes, Should such a Faith Offend?	201
Barry, Roma Sacra	115
,, Triumph of Life	454
Bartlet, Psychology of Christian Faith	455
Barton, What Can a Man Believe?	303, 333
Baylis, Minucius Felix	302
Baynes, Israel	156
Bell, The Modern Parson	308
Bethune-Baker, The Way of Modernism	398
Billen, Old Latin Texts	158
Binns, The Evangelical Movement in the English Church	498
Blau, Das Problem des Leidens	86
Blunt, Israel in World History	156
Bornhausen, Der Elröser	522
Brasnett, Suffering of the Impassible God	500
Brown, Life of Prayer	61
Brunner, Religionsphilosophie Evangelischer Theologie	521
,, Der Mittler	521
Budde, Jesaia's Erleben	262
Burch, The Structure and Message of St. John's Gospel	453
Burton, N.T. Word Studies	252
Cadbury, Making of Luke–Acts	110
Cadoux, Resurrection and Second Advent	387
Cairns, Faith that Rebels	540
Carr, Unique Status of Man	400
Carter, Reformers and Holy Scripture	407
Case, Jesus	60
Cash, Expansion of Islam	501
Champion, More than Atonement	209
Chaplin, Effects of the Reformation on Ideals of Life and Conduct	210
Christian Social Reformers of the Nineteenth Century	96
Clegg, Narrative Dialogues from the Bible	15
Coleman-Norton, Palladii Dialogus de Vita S. Joannis Chrysostomi	500
Confirmation	161
Coulton, Five Centuries of Religion, ii.	201
Creelman, Introduction to the O.T.	304
Crum, Original Jerusalem Gospel	52, 61
Cutten, Speaking with Tongues	165
Dalman, Aramäische Dialektproben	86
,, Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina, i.	472
Deane, Jesus Christ	158
Dearmer, Truth about Fasting	359
Deissmann, Light from the Ancient East	340, 399
De Man, Psychology of Socialism	482
Dörries, Der ferne und der nahe Gott	262
Dorsey, Evolution of Charles Darwin	501
Duff, History of Religion of Judaism	146
Easton, The Gospel before the Gospels	353
Eissfeldt, Vom Lebenswerk eines Religionshistorikers	520
Elliott, Religion and Dramatic Art	119
Entwicklungsstufen der Jüdischen Religion	
Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation	
Evans, Theistic Monism	
Evans-Wentz, Tibetan Book of the Dead	
Feine, Der Apostel Paulus	
Fiebig, Das Vaterunser	
Fiske, Purpose in Teaching Religion	
Fleming, History of the Church in Scotland	
Flower, Approach to Psychology of Religion	
Foakes-Jackson, Rise of Gentile Christianity	
,, Peter	
Fosdick, Pilgrimage to Palestine	
Frick, Wissenschaftliches und Pneumatisches Verständniss der Bibel	
Fulton, Nature and God	
Galling, Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels	
Galloway, Faith and Reason	
Gamble, Traditional Idea of God	
Garnett, Instinct and Personality	
Gaster, The Asatir	
Gavin, Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments	
Gillman, Evolution of English Hymn	
Gollock, Sons of Africa	
Goodspeed, New Solutions of N.T. Problems	
Gore, Christ and Society	
Green, Our Lord and Saviour	
Gregory, Human Migration	
Griffith, John Bunyan	
Grubb, Christianity as Life	
Gunkel, What Remains of the O.T.	
Gurney, Alive for Evermore	
Haldar, Neo-Hegelianism	

PAGE

Harnack, Die Entstehung der christlicher Theologie . 38
Harris, First Steps in Philosophy of Religion . 16
,, Eucharistic Origins . 197
,, Twelve Apostles . 205
Hartill, Necessity of Redemption 112
Hasan, Realism . . . 496
Hayes, Heights of Christian Unity 119, 288
Hebrew Union College Annual, iv. 164
Henderson, Handbook to O.T. 354
Henson, Book and Vote . 357
Hicks, Ways Towards the Spiritual Life . . . 544
Hobhouse, William Law . . 60
Hodgson, And was made Man 497
Holtzmann, Das Neue Testament 37
Hoyle, Holy Spirit in St. Paul 161
Hubbard, Ultimate Epoch . 358
Inge, Church in the World . 203
Jacks, Constructive Citizenship 206
James, Latin Infancy Gospels 159
Jones, Christ at the Round Table . . . 334
,, New Studies in Mystical Religion . . 165, 478
Keller, Protestant Europe . 63
Kent, Proverbs . . . 352
Knudson, Philosophy of Personalism 9
Krüger, Immortality of Man . 502
Lawlor and Oulton, Eusebius, ii. 451
Leete, Christianity in Science 452
Legacy of Israel . . . 194
Lidgett, God, Christ, and the Church 114
Lindsay, Nature of Religious Truth 163
Luccock, Preaching Values . 431
Ludwig, Son of Man. . . 499
McFadyen, O.T. Scenes and Characters 397
Mackichan, Missionary Ideal in Scottish Churches . . 117
Mackinnon, Luther and the Reformation, ii. . . . 304
Maclean, The Future Life . 112
M'Nair, Scots Theology in the Eighteenth Century . . 453
Marmorstein, Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God . . . 254
Matheson, Hastings Rashdall 566
Maynard, Seven Years of O.T. Study 404
Mee, Pocket Bible . . . 117
Michell, Historical Truth of the Bible 404
Milum, Evolution . . . 502
Mingana, Woodbrooke Studies 202
Moffatt, Expositor's Year-Book . . . 164
,, Handbook to Hymnary . . . 282

PAGE

Moffatt, Peter, James, and Judas . . . 448
Montgomery, Daniel . . 154
Moore, Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era 374
More, Christ the Word . . 161
Morgan, Importance of Tertullian 502
Morrison, Scottish Churches' Work Abroad . 206
,, Christ in Shakespeare . . . 430
Mosapp, Doctor Martin Luther 87
Mozley, Doctrine of God . 307
Müller, Jesus as I see Him 388, 400
Nairne, Life Eternal . . 306
Nestle, Greek N.T. . . . 429
Odeberg, 3 Enoch . . . 498
Oesterley, Jewish Background to the Christian Liturgy . . 65
,, Wisdom of Egypt and O.T. . . . 97
Old Testament: Amer. Trans., ed. Smith 171
Old Testament Essays . . 290
Old Testament in Greek, ii. . 205
Otto, Das Jahr der Kirche . 39
Owen, Some Authentic Acts of the Early Martyrs . . 118
Painter, Man of Nazareth . 360
Pallis, Notes on St. Luke and the Acts 400
Paret, Die Geschichte des Islams 472
Patrick, Story of the Church's Song 282
Peake, Presidential Address . 483
Pearson, Church and State . 397
Peck, Divine Revolution . 114
Purinton, Achievement of Israel 64
Pym, Spiritual Direction . 503
Quick, Christian Sacraments . 108
Rade, Glaubenslehre, iii. . 261
Rae, How to Teach the N.T. 155
Rahn, Science and the Religious Life . . . 533, 542
Ransome, The Chinese Puzzle 452
Rauschenbusch, Prayers of the Social Awakening . 143
Raven, Women and Holy Orders . . . 384
,, Quest of Religion . 399
Religionswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellung 37
Religious Thought in Last Quarter-Century . . . 305
Rendall, Epistle of James 101, 112
Richardson, English Preachers 503
Richter, Allgemeine Evangelische Missionsgeschichte 470
Robertson, Jesus the Citizen . 107
Robinson, Twelve Minor Prophets . . . 12
,, Giving and Receiving . . . 405

PAGE

Robinson, Genius of Hebrew Grammar . . 405
,, Gospel of Matthew 448
,, The Life of Paul . 452
,, Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit . . 481, 495
Rogers, Morals in Review . 352
,, The Case for Christianity . . . 448
Russell, Outline of Philosophy 157
Sanctis, Religious Conversion 250
Sanders, S. François de Sales 503
Schmidt, Das Gebet der Angeklagten . . . 520
Schonfield, Old Hebrew Text of Matthew's Gospel . 149, 160
Schubert - Christaller, Der Gottesdienst der Synagoge . 471
Sclater, Public Worship . 301
Scott, Textual Discoveries in Proverbs, Psalms, and Isaiah. . . 206
,, Heraldry of His Disciples 240
,, Scotland through American Eyes. . 450
Scullard, Ethics of the Gospel 115
Segal, Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew 111
Sellers, Eustathius of Antioch 500
Shears, Christ or Bentham ? 50
Sheppard, Impatience of a Parson 141
Simon, John Wesley . . 63
Simpson, Ideas in Corporate Worship 101
Smith, Sacramental Society . 1, 10
,, S. Matthew . . . 116
,, Isaiah, rev. ed. . . 225
,, Current Christian Thinking . . . 289
Smithen, Continental Protestantism 116
Sneath, Evolution of Ethics . 62
Soares, Religious Education . 499
Soltau, Pascal 113
Speaker's Bible . . . 284
Spencer, Civilization remade by Christ 305
Staab, Die Pauluskatenen . 325
Stafford, Sermon on the Mount 13
Stoddart, Private Prayer . 93
Students and the Faith, ed. Povah 64
Temple, Christianity and State 355
Tennant, Philosophical Theology, i. 541
Thomas, Problem of Sin in N.T. 111
Thompson, Suttee . . . 402
,, Epic of Gilgamish 449
Tillyard, Spiritual Exercises . 160
Torrey, Second Isaiah . . 529
Vierzig Jahre 'Christliche Welt' 93

	PAGE
Vollrath, Theologie der Gegenwart in Grossbritannien	411
Walpole, Great Reality	306
Warfield, Revelation and Inspiration	255
Wates, All for the Golden Age	253
Webb, Religious Thought in the Oxford Movement	449
Weber, Glaube und Mystik	86
Whitham, Judges	406
Wiener, Altars of the O.T.	404
Willey, Early Church Portraits	206
Wilson, St. Paul and Paganism	300
,, Child Psychology	474
Wobbermin, Schleiermacher und Ritschl	522
Wolf, Correspondence of Spinoza	451
Wood, In Pursuit of Truth	62
Worrell, Study of Races in Ancient Near East	153
Wotherspoon, Religious Values in the Sacraments	497
Wright, Sermon on the Mount	94

HEBREW WORDS.

	PAGE
אַדִּיר (Ps 82⁷)	382
אוּבַל	427
בְּרֵכָה	381 f.
בְּתוּרַת (Ps 1²)	90
חֶסֶד	535
יהו, יה, יו	291
עֵינָא, עַיִן	91, 427
ענק	330
עֶרֶף	426
צֶדֶק	330 f.
קרקע	149 f., 332
שַׁעַר	427
שָׁלֵם	330

GREEK WORDS.

	PAGE
ἀλήθεια	526
ἀνεξιχνίαστον	283
διὰ τοῦτο . . . ὅτι	308
διὰ τὴν δικαίωσιν ἡμῶν	87
δοῦλος	136
ἐξουσίαν	139
υἱοθεσία	20

TEXTS.

	PAGE
Gn i. 1–3	293
iii. 1	22
xxii. 4	270
xxvi. 8	48
xxvi. 19	385
xxviii. 12	223
xxxii. 24	223
xxxix. 4, 21	267
Ex xiii. 17 f.	460
xxiv. 9–11	416
xxv.	147
xxv. 22	147
xl. 35	26
Lv v. 8	426
Dt vi. 5	367
viii. 2	71
xxiv. 19	559
Jg v. 14	191
1 K vi. 34, 35	23
2 K v. 27	514
Job xvi. 12	265
xix. 25	181
xxxviii. 1	137
Ps i. 2	90
viii. 8	555
xix. 9	463
xxiii. 3	414
xlii.	140
xliii.	140
lxxiii. 16, 17	368
lxxx. 28	190
lxxxii. 7	382
ciii. 12	222
cxix. 71	174
cxxi. 1	270
cxxiii. 3, 4	434
Pr vi. 6	507
xix. 23	526
Song ii. 11, 12	319
Is ii. 5	73
vii. 17, 20	531
xxv. 9	128
xliii. 14	530
xlv. 1	531
xlix. 15	71
liii. 3	527
lv. 13	122
Jer v. 1	23
viii. 20	561
Ezk i. 5, 28	75
xii. 22	191
xxviii. 12–19	291
Jonah iv. 8	332
Hab i. 6	531
Hos vi. 6	534
Mt iii. 13–15	419
iv. 17	417
iv. 19	462
v. 4	239
v. 8	556
v. 17–48	342
v. 40	52
vi. 1–18	408
vi. 9	28
vi. 19, 20	316
vi. 19–34	443
vii. 1–5	486
vii. 3–5	91, 427
vii. 7–12	545
viii. 1	179
viii. 4	557
viii. 20	149, 332
xi. 5	465
xvi. 18	485
xvii. 20	467
xxvi. 6–13	137
Mt xxvi. 40	271
xxvi. 50	288
xxvii. 34	220
Mk ix. 24	467
x. 18	331
xiii. 13	219
xiv. 3–9	137
xvi. 12	320
Lk. ii. 38	431
ii. 49	235
v. 11	25
vi. 29	53
vi. 36	123
vi. 41, 42	91, 427
vii. 36–50	137
ix. 51	175
xi. 2	124
xiii. 18, 19	32
xv. 10	218
xvi. 1–13	120
Jn i. 39	556
ii. 5	177
v. 25	315
ix. 39	76
xii. 1–11	137
xii. 21	287, 435
xx. 19, 20	317
Ac i. 11	92
ii. 4	370
vi. 15	380
xv. 20, 29	428
xx. 6–12	235
xxi. 25	428
Ro iv. 25	87
v.	476
vii. 19	72
ix. 17	468
xii. 1	176
Ro xii. 13, 14	46
xiv. 12	126
xv. 4	78
1 Co i. 4	268
i. 28	511
ii. 9	237
xi. 10	139, 283
xv. 25	124
xv. 32	281
xvi. 22	340
2 Co vii. 5 f.	512
xi. 6	459
Gal i. 15, 16	322
iv. 14	458
iv. 19	322
Eph. i. 5–7	16
i. 18	266
iii. 8	283
iv. 20, 21	526
Ph i. 12	324
ii. 9	527
iii. 13	129
iii. 20	509
iv. 13	217
Col i. 27	322
iii. 12–14	508
iv. 18	461
1 Th iii. 12	415
1 Ti vi. 18	554
2 Ti ii. 2	366
Tit iii. 8	30
Ja i. 23	101
iii. 6	101, 333
1 Jn ii. 1, 2	473
iv. 7–11, 18	421, 534
Rev i. 5, 6	372
iii. 15	365
xxi. 13	183

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Dr. Ryder Smith does not express himself hopefully in his Fernley Lecture (noticed in another column) on the subject of the Reunion of Christendom. He would remind us that the controversy about Church, Ministry, and Sacraments still goes on, and is still a thwarting influence; and he is of opinion that, even if all unjustifiable schisms were undone, there would yet remain three churches—'the Sacerdotalist, holding that certain symbols are essential to the Church; the Sacramental, holding that the two Sacraments are obligatory, that other symbols are serviceable, but that no symbol is essential; and a third church, consisting of those who, denying that any symbol or Sacrament is either obligatory or essential, and looking upon all ritual as a hindrance rather than a help, strive to use it as little as possible.'

This position is illustrated in respect of the Sacraments in the statement which was unanimously adopted at the World Conference on Faith and Order, held at Lausanne in August: 'The Orthodox Church and others hold that there are seven Sacraments, and that for their valid administration there must be proper form, proper matter, and a proper ministry. Others can regard only Baptism and the Lord's Supper as Sacraments; others, again, while attaching high value to the sacramental principle, do not make use of the outward sign of the Sacrament, but hold that all spiritual benefits are given through contact with God and through His Spirit.' (We quote from the newspaper report.)

It is upon the question of the two Sacraments that Dr. Ryder Smith concentrates. Upholding the Sacramental as against the Sacerdotalist view (the late Dr. P. T. Forsyth distinguished the two views as the Sacramental and the Sacramentarian), he is led to affirm that Baptism and the Lord's Supper, while obligatory or authoritative, are not essential. 'The essential admits of no exceptions, but the obligatory may' (*sic*). But is there any Church, he adds, whether Sacramental or Sacerdotal, that excludes every one, without exception, who fails to observe the Lord's Supper?

With this question and challenge the rigidity of Dr. Ryder Smith's classification of the 'three churches' appears to break down. That it is no longer a rigid classification is illustrated in another paragraph of the statement on the Sacraments which was adopted at the Lausanne Conference: 'We recognize that under certain conditions the spiritual values of the Sacraments may be realized by Divine grace where the outward signs are absent.'

What is the basis, let us ask, of the distinction between the Sacerdotalist and the Sacramental? The distinction rests upon differing conceptions of the relation between the material and the spiritual in the Sacraments. As regards the Lord's Supper the centre of controversy is to be found in the phrases of our Lord, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood.' Both schools affirm their belief in the 'real presence'; but whereas the Sacramental

school says that it is a spiritual presence, the Sacerdotal school says that it is also a physical or material presence. Without our Lord's physical presence there is no guarantee, it is urged, of His spiritual presence at all.

Dr. Ryder Smith has nothing new to say on the interpretation of the phrases, 'This is my body,' 'This is my blood,' but what he says, from the Sacramental as distinguished from the Sacerdotalist standpoint, is well said. As he reminds us, there are parallels within the Bible, from both Testaments, to the use of the verb 'to be' under which the phrases above named mean respectively, 'This is the symbol of my body,' 'This stands for my blood.' For example, 'The seven good kine *are* seven years, and the seven good ears *are* seven years'; 'these bones *are* the whole house of Israel'; 'golden bowls full of incense, which *are* the prayers of the saints'; 'these women *are* two covenants'; 'the field *is* the world'; 'this cup *is* the new covenant in my blood.'

Much less familiar are Dr. Ryder Smith's citations from Ignatius, which are relevant to the interpretation of the phrases before us, though adduced in his exposition of Jn 6. For example, 'I am God's wheat, and I am ground by wild beasts' teeth, in order that I may be found pure bread'; or again, 'I desire God's bread, which is the flesh of Christ, who is of David's seed, and I desire as drink His blood, which is incorruptible love.' These passages from the Roman Epistle illustrate the extreme uses to which the metaphor and symbol of 'bread' could be put. In the first, Ignatius uses the eating of flesh as symbolic of the making of bread, and the latter as typical of fellowship with God, just as John uses the eating of bread as symbolic of the eating of flesh, and the latter as typical of fellowship with God. In the second passage, Ignatius does not say, 'I long for the Eucharist,' but, 'I long for martyrdom.'

Our debt to Principal George Galloway of St. Andrews is very great. His chosen field is the philosophy of religion, a field that is most fascinating but most difficult. On that subject he has already given us several works of high merit. He has written the only book which might be called a text-book. Writers on the philosophy of religion are apt to make one or other of two mistakes. They tend to become so speculative and profound that we lose sight of the cogency of their argument. Or they strike us like men who start out running on one side of an impenetrable hedge, only to appear later on on the other side, and however much we rub our eyes we cannot perceive the gap by which they made the crossing. Principal Galloway avoids both those criticisms. Profound as is his thought, we can always follow him. If there be a hedge he frankly calls our attention to it, and if a convenient gap is not evident he frankly tells us that too.

Our debt is great and it is increasing. We have received and read with great satisfaction his volume of Essays entitled *Faith and Reason in Religion* (Nisbet; 7s. 6d. net). The relations of faith and reason constitute an old but a perennial problem. It exercised the Middle Ages. It was very much alive in the eighteenth century. It produced a great quantity of literature, chiefly in Germany, a quarter of a century ago, and recently again it seems to be arousing fresh attention. It appeals in special form indeed to each successive generation. As Principal Galloway remarks: 'The way in which the problem was conceived and treated in the third century or in the eighteenth differs from the way in which it is handled to-day. The answers which satisfied the men of a bygone time do not satisfy us; for though the problems themselves remain, we see them in an altered intellectual and spiritual perspective.' 'Some ages have felt the pressure of this problem more severely than others. But there can be no doubt that it presses hardly on our age; for we live in days which, more than most, are haunted by the question of the validity of spiritual values and the truth of theological doctrines.' His aim is frankly to recognize the rights both of faith and of reason, and do justice to both.

The main topic is most directly handled in the first Essay on 'Knowledge and Religious Faith.'

It is a masterly handling of a great subject. The issue of a long and careful investigation runs thus: 'While Religion should have sympathy with knowledge and its tasks, while it should treat science as an ally and not as an enemy, it cannot abate its insistence on the claims of faith. As a fact of experience it seems to be true, that an exclusive dependence on reason tends to end in disillusionment and a lapse into nescience.' 'As we grow older most of us, I suppose, feel more keenly the mystery which remains despite all the enterprise and toil of human thinking. And if our sole ground of hope were in the powers of reason, we might well conclude that of ultimate origins and destinies we can know nothing.' 'Reason leaves its task unfinished, and man has to win through faith the world view, the synthesis which his spiritual needs demand. Through faith, and only through faith, does man gain the assurance which forms the stable basis of his religious life, the assurance that there is a living God over all, and that things work together for good.'

'The realm of faith is not the realm of logical thinking, where premises and conclusions are firmly knit together. Here the element of logical compulsion is and must be lacking. For faith is a movement of the whole personality; it is an act of personal preference and freedom. Hence faith cannot be coerced, and no spiritual conviction can be created by a parade of arguments and religious evidences. Any appeal for faith remains futile unless it evoke a free response from the soul; the spirit must seek if it is to find, it must ask if it is to receive. Were faith less than this it would not be the act of a responsible ethical spirit. The conception of faith as an act of freedom suggests to us its moral and spiritual significance in human life. Though faith is free it is not capricious, for it springs from and expresses the universal need of the soul. It is man's personal consciousness of his spiritual needs, and his personal response to them, which he embodies in his faith in that transcendent Good which is the ground of the world and his own being.'

The other essays are all deeply suggestive. They deal with 'The Genesis and Truth of Religious Beliefs,' 'Evolution and the Finality of the Christian Religion,' 'History and its Religious Interpretation,' 'The Theological Antithesis of Grace and Freedom,' 'Butler as an Apologist,' and 'The Study of Theology and the Work of the Ministry.'

One of the great words of the English Bible is 'salvation,' and there is no doubt that English readers generally give to the word a signification that is theological and traditional. In this they are not altogether to blame, for the translators themselves were under the influence of theological doctrines current in their time, and so the words 'salvation' and 'save' were insensibly impregnated with meanings which are not really to be found in many of the passages where the words occur. That is the thesis of a careful and interesting discussion by Professor M. A. Canney in the current number of *Theology*.

Professor Canney points out that William Tyndale, in his translation of the New Testament, made a courageous attempt to find new renderings for Greek words of which the English equivalents had acquired in the course of time ecclesiastical and technical associations which were not present to the minds of the Evangelists. Thus (as Dr. Pollard, in his edition of Tyndale, points out) for 'church,' 'priest,' 'grace,' 'charity,' Tyndale substituted 'congregation,' 'senior' (*sic l*), 'favour,' 'love.' This reasonable effort met with great opposition, and hindered the acceptance of Tyndale's translation. But modern translators have followed in his train, and Moffatt, for example, frequently discards the renderings 'save' and 'saviour' for more accurate equivalents.

The Hebrew word, or group of words, which is rendered by 'save,' 'saviour,' 'salvation,' really means more. It does often mean 'deliver,' but its wider significance is nearer the idea of sufficiency or fullness of life and power. And so Moffatt frequently translates the noun 'hero' or 'champion,' for example in Jg 3^1, where the R.V. has 'the Lord raised up a saviour to the children of Israel, who

saved them,' and Moffatt has 'the Eternal raised up a champion for the Israelites, who rescued them,' and 2 K 13^5, where R.V. has 'the Lord gave Israel a saviour,' and Moffatt has 'the Eternal gave Israel a hero.'

There is another Hebrew verb which is translated 'save,' but it means properly 'to live.' In several passages, for example, we have 'God save the King,' or 'God save King Adonijah.' This really means 'Long life to the King,' or 'Long live Adonijah,' like the French 'vive le roi,' or 'vive l'entente.' In the causative form the word is used of reviving or bringing to life again, and often occurs in this sense in the Old Testament, where God is spoken of as One who causes men to live on, or One who gives life. It will be seen that, so far as the Old Testament is concerned, the words translated in our versions, both A.V. and R.V., as 'save,' 'saviour,' and 'salvation' have nothing at all in them of the traditional theological idea of salvation from sin by an atonement. They mean 'help' or 'deliverance' in a sense indicated by the context, or, more generally, they mean that gift which a sufficient God can offer to His people in any time of need so as to add to their fullness of life.

But what of the New Testament? Professor Canney suggests that throughout the New Testament the dominant idea is life or new life. The woman who touched Christ's garments, for example, said, 'If I touch but his garments, I shall be made whole.' The R.V., obsessed with the word 'save,' puts in the margin 'I shall be saved.' An old version, the Syriac Peshitta, has 'I shall live.' So in a passage in which Jesus says, 'Daughter, thy faith hath made thee whole,' R.V. margin has 'thy faith hath saved thee.' Professor Canney points out that the Syriac versions invariably render the word translated 'save' in our versions by verbs meaning to give life. In the words at the Cross, for example, 'He saved others, himself he cannot save,' they translate 'He gave life to others, but he cannot preserve his own life!'

The significant conclusion of this study is to give support to the suggestion made by Burkitt, that Jesus described Himself, and was described, according to Aramaic usage, as Life-giver rather than as Saviour. If this were so, the Fourth Gospel, in the general impression of the teaching of Jesus which it gives, may be felt to reflect that teaching better than the Synoptists. And, further, it is interesting to note that this is being regarded in our time as the whole meaning of religion, and particularly of Christianity—life, access to life, fullness of life. The idea of being 'saved' by the blood of Jesus from the wrath of God here or hereafter has little meaning for men and women to-day. We are 'saved' when we gain true life. We are 'saved' when we learn to pierce the dead husk of life and penetrate to the living kernel. We are 'saved' when we succeed in recognizing or apprehending the spiritual realities hidden behind material phenomena. Salvation means a new birth, a new consciousness, a new life.

The Holy Spirit in the Bible.

By Principal the Reverend H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., D.D., Regent's Park College, London.

Amongst the toys of childhood is—or was—the kaleidoscope, that transparent box of fragments of coloured glass, yielding the symmetry of an ever-changing pattern when viewed through the triangular tube of mirrors which multiplied and co-ordinated their 'broken lights.' No doctrine of the Bible is more kaleidoscopic than that of the Holy Spirit, whether we choose to think of the fragmentary elements which exhibit the πολυποίκιλος σοφία of God, or of the elusive transformations which the doctrine undergoes within the thousand years of its revolving history, or of its fascination

as we see it reflected backwards and forwards between God and man and human society.

The primitive and fundamental idea of 'spirit' (*ruach*) is that of active power or energy (ἐνέργεια not δύναμις), power superhuman, mysterious, elusive, of which the *ruach* or wind of the desert was not so much the symbol as the most familiar example.[1] When we read books of travel in Arabia, such as Doughty's *Arabia Deserta* or Lawrence's *Revolt in the Desert*, we are often made to feel the overwhelming power of the wind across the desert, scorching heat by day and piercing cold by night. This elemental force, incalculable and irresistible and invisible, was surely akin to that which could shape a man's behaviour as strangely as the desert sand was shaped before the blast. There was a demonic power which sometimes took possession of men, for good or for evil, enabling them to do for a season what was normally impossible. Such energy 'rushed upon' Samson, when he tore a lion limb from limb (Jg 14^6; cf. 13^{25}), slew thirty men (14^{19}), burst the ropes that bound him (15^{14}), or upon Saul, when he cut in pieces a yoke of oxen in prophetic symbolism (1 S 11^6); it would explain the heroic valour with which Othniel (Jg 3^{10}) or Jephthah (11^{29}) led Israel to war, and Gideon sounded the war-horn (6^{34}). The abnormality might lie in qualities rather than in deeds, and therefore be less dramatic and more permanent, such as those displayed by David, after his anointing by Samuel (1 S 16^{13}), or by the Messianic prince (Is $11^{2ff.}$), or by the prophet charged with a Divine message ($61^{1ff.}$), or by the wise Joseph (Gn 41^{38}), the efficient Joshua (Nu 27^{18}), the artistic Bezalel (Ex 31^3), the faithful Caleb (Nu 14^{24}). But originally the *ruach* is a non-moral energy, which may issue in evil as well as in good, like the evil *ruach* that divided Abimelech and the Shechemites (Jg 9^{23}), or made a husband doubt his wife's fidelity (Nu $5^{14.\ 30}$) or a people unfaithful to its God (Hos 4^{12} 5^4). In one instance only is this *ruach* clearly personalized, namely, in the vision of Micaiah (1 K 22^{21}); and here it is a lying *ruach* employed by Yahweh to 'inspire' the optimistic prophets. This passage shows us how objective the prophetic inspiration was conceived to be—as objective in its origin as in its earlier phenomena—as when Saul stripped off his clothes and 'prophesied' before Samuel (1 S 19^{18-24}). The energy is so materialistically conceived that it can be transferred from one to another (Nu $11^{17.\ 25}$, 2 K $2^{9ff.}$). Amongst the greater prophets, the physical phenomena were incidental rather than essential to their message, though probably none would have reckoned himself, or have been recognized by others, as a prophet without some such abnormal experience. Indeed, Ezekiel is the only one of these to connect *ruach* directly and explicitly with his prophetic inspiration, though others (*e.g.* Hosea) seem to imply it.

So far we have been concerned simply with the psychical and physical results of a superhuman energy, similar to the phenomena encountered elsewhere by the student of primitive animism. The only difference (but it is a great one) is that in the Old Testament these phenomena are brought under the control of Yahweh, instead of irresponsible demons and 'spirits.' This centralization meant, of course, ultimately a complete moralization of the idea of Spirit, in proportion as the idea of Yahweh Himself was moralized, through the teaching of the great prophets. But it meant more than this. We must always beware of making the Hebrew mind more 'metaphysical' than it ever was; but so far as Israel did advance to a philosophy of the Divine nature, it was in terms of *ruach*. The Egyptian empire with its powerful cavalry was reckoned irresistible in Isaiah's day, but he bids his compatriots remember that the Egyptians are men and not God, and their horses flesh and not *ruach* (Is 31^3). This is the true Hebrew dualism—not the contrast between the human body and the soul (or spirit), but that between terrestrial nature as being of one order and the celestial as being of another (cf. 1 Co 15^{40}). The contrast, as Duhm acutely remarks, 'forms the driving force of the subsequent religious development up to the fifteenth of First Corinthians.' A similar contrast underlies the obscure legend of the mingling of the 'sons of God' with the daughters of men (Gn $6^{1ff.}$). The Hebrews thought of God as being in human form, yet of a different substance from man; His body was of fiery brilliance (Ezk $1^{26.\ 27}$), so dazzling that even the most favoured of mortals could not bear a frontal view of Him (Ex $33^{17ff.}$). It is never said that this substance was *ruach*, yet it belongs to the realm of *ruach*; and it is significant that when that Hebrew of Hebrews, the Apostle Paul, was faced by a similar problem in the Christological realm, he says explicitly, 'The Lord is the Spirit' (2 Co 3^{17}), whilst the Fourth Gospel takes the further step and says, 'God is Spirit' (4^{24}). We must not read back the full content of these words into the Old Testament conception of Yahweh, with all its naïve realism. But at least we may see some preparation for them in the way in which His activity is described as His presence (*i.e.* 'face'), and this paralleled

[1] Cf. Shelley's 'Ode to the West Wind.'

with His *ruach*. We must note the full significance of Hebrew parallelism when we read :

> Cast me not away from thy face,
> And take not thy holy *ruach* from me
> (Ps 51^{11}).

Where God is present He is always active, and no word gathers up His activity more completely than this word *ruach*. Yahweh's presence among His people means that His *ruach* is in their midst (Hag $2^{4.5}$, LXX); indeed, the Divine *ruach* is virtually hypostatized in Is $63^{10.11}$, where rebellion grieves the *ruach* of His holiness in the midst of Israel (LXX omits the reference to Moses). Yet here again we must remember that the hypostatization, such as it is, is Hebrew and not Greek. So with the assertion of the Divine omnipresence in Ps 139^{7} :

> Whither shall I go from thy *ruach* ?
> Or whither shall I flee from thy face ?

As Volz rightly says : 'the omnipresence of Yahweh does not depend on the *ruach* of Yahweh, but on Yahweh Himself ; Yahweh is in heaven and in Sheol (v.^{8}), at the uttermost end of the world His hand holds man (v.$^{9f.}$). It goes without saying that His *ruach* and His Face (*panim*) are also omnipresent' (*Der Geist Gottes*, p. 147, n. 1).

Parallel with this highly important development of the idea of *ruach* within the theological realm, there was another, intimately connected with it, yet much less obvious, within the anthropological. The original idea of *ruach* as an invasive energy, used to explain the abnormal in man's conduct, was so far naturalized as to allow the use of the term for the more marked energies of life, even when there was no suggestion of an invasion from the supernatural realm. Thus when the weary and thirsty Samson finds water and drinks, 'his *ruach* returned and he lived,' *i.e.* his life-energy was renewed (Jg 15^{19}), and when the queen of Sheba saw Solomon's wisdom and splendour 'there was no more *ruach* in her,' *i.e.* she was utterly overwhelmed (1 K 10^{5}). In such passages, we must forget all we have been told about a Hebrew trichotomy or even dichotomy, and take the word simply as meaning 'energy,' for this is all that it does mean, as applied to man, *before the Exile*. But when the creation of the world and of man had been ascribed to Yahweh, the breath (*neshamah*) and the breath-soul (*nephesh*), which were the principle of human life, came to be conceived as due to the inbreathing of Yahweh. He had moulded the physical organism—the 'flesh'—but it was inanimate until He blew into its nostrils living breath. The wind itself, however, was Yahweh's breath, and so, in course of time (but not before the Exile), the breath of man came to be called by the same term as the wind, namely, *ruach*. This was naturally extended to cover the psychical phenomena of the breath-soul, though never to the point of displacing the original term for this (*nephesh*), or the terms for certain physical organs (such as the heart) to which psychical functions were ascribed. *The term* ruach *was thus naturalized in man's life as it had been supernaturalized in God's*. The importance of this anthropological development (hardly yet realized by theologians, because only a critical study of the terms will reveal it) will be obvious to any one who knows the Pauline pneumatology. *Ruach* as an element, or rather, an aspect of human nature, would always tend to suggest its origin in God's creative activity ; its very use linked man to God, bridging the gulf of the Isaianic contrast of flesh and spirit by the assertion of an implicit kinship. Here, in man's *ruach*, was a potential contact for the inflow of new accessions of the Divine *ruach* ; to use the term was to keep the door open for God. It gave to the Biblical idea of man a certain δύναμις which is one of its most characteristic features—the potentiality for the yet greater things, and the suggestion that their possibility lay in the ἐνέργεια of God. If it seems an exaggeration to base this conception on the mere identity of terms, the answer must be to point to the enormous influence of terminology on theological and philosophical thought—think of the dominance of Christian thought by the term *Logos*, largely because it expressed at once the inner thought and the outer word. But we are here dealing with much more than a mere identity of terms. The careful study of the Old Testament in its true chronological order will reveal that as 'wind' became 'Spirit' in relation to God, so 'Spirit' became 'spirit' in man. If we reverse this order, as we do when we take *ruach* to be a constituent of the idea of man from the beginning, ignoring all the evidence of literary criticism, then we shall not only create a 'trichotomy' which never existed in Hebrew thought, but we shall blur the line of development and confuse the true Biblical conception of the relation of man to God.

It is in the pages of the New Testament that we first see the full significance of this long development. The Christian consciousness might be not unfairly described as the democratization of the prophetic consciousness through the gift of the Holy Spirit. This is true whether we think of the cruder side of prophecy in its psycho-physical

phenomena, or of its moral and spiritual side realized by the greater prophets. This consciousness includes a new experience of God (through Jesus Christ), a new emphasis on the supernatural, a new sense of power, notably in the conflict with those many 'spiritual' powers which thronged the air of the ancient world. The conflict can be traced through the Synoptics, in the war waged by Jesus in the power of the Spirit against the demons of disease and insanity; or in the Spirit-world of the Apostle Paul, filled with principalities and powers; or, again, in more etherealized form, in the Johannine conception of the world, the flesh, and the devil. The new sense of power, always the characteristic creation of the Spirit, breaks into consciousness at Pentecost, where it is seen in the creation of a new fellowship. On the individual side, though never divorced from the communal, we have the Pauline experience of deliverance by the Holy Spirit, which is exhibited most fully in the seventh and eighth of Romans. On the communal side, again in closest relation to the individual, we have the development of the doctrine in the Fourth Gospel.

The increasing recognition that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is central in the Christian thought of the Apostle Paul (rather than the Rabbinical doctrine of 'justification') marks a great advance in the interpretation of his gospel. Every other conception of his is baptized into this, and most of all the concrete fact of history—the Cross of Christ. The whole life of the Christian, normal and abnormal, is brought within the sphere of the Holy Spirit. This comprehensive view, with its new evaluation of the phenomena, forms Paul's greatest contribution to the doctrine. He had learnt from the Old Testament to regard πνεῦμα (with the content of *ruach*) as a normal constituent of human nature, its highest aspect (*e.g.* Ro 8^{16}). From the same source came the long tradition to explain all supernatural influences by the same term. But apart from his new conviction about Jesus, that after all He was the Christ, the contact between supernatural power and the potentialities of human nature would never have been made for him. When it had been made, on the road to Damascus, there came not only a new ability to fulfil the old moral ideals of Pharisaism, but a new conception of life. As he came to realize that the human personality of Jesus, dominated by the ethics of the Cross, really belonged to the 'heavenlies,' and was therefore the most essential link in the chain of the Spirit, the doctrine of the Spirit was transformed for him—personalized, ethicized, as never before. It claimed the whole of human life, and claimed it to new ends and in new ways of working. He could not be content with the conventional views which specialized the activities of the Spirit in such *charismata* as 'Tongues' and 'Prophecy.' He saw those activities in the more valuable *charismata* of service to the community, the gifts of healing and helpfulness, of administration and government, and, above all, that gift of the Christian ἀγάπη, upon which the proper exercise of every other gift and grace depended. He traced back to the Holy Spirit of God (or Christ) the whole of the inner life also—the mediation of Christian experience, the union with Christ, the assurance of sonship, the consecration of life, the specific virtues, and the extension of this life into the life beyond death, of which we have already the beginning in the 'earnest' of the Spirit, and of which the final feature will be a 'spiritual' body, commensurate to the needs of the redeemed spirit. The ethical realism of this Pauline mysticism owes its form, doubtless, to his Jewish nature and nurture, but its content is drawn from the Person and Work of Jesus Christ, through whom the Spirit of God flows.

The communal aspect of the Holy Spirit has been already implied in the reference to the *charismata*; these gifts of the Spirit are bestowed on the community, in the community, and for the community, and the spirit of selfish display or ostentatious individualism comes from another quarter. It is as much out of date for historical exegesis to discuss whether the spirit-filled individual or the spirit-filled Church comes first, as it is to discuss whether individual or social life in general is primary. As in the natural order, so in the spiritual—the individual and the group grow together into a new consciousness of their inherent nature, and the individual life is inherently social, whilst the social life does not exist at all save through its individual representatives. The authority of the Church by which it declares that 'it seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us' (Ac $15^{25.\ 28}$), is the authority of Spirit-led individuals in their group relation; it is the collective consciousness of the Church which speaks through the mouths of its prophets (13^{2}). The unity of the Church through this indwelling Spirit is the particular theme of the Epistle to the Ephesians—'one Body and one Spirit . . . one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all' ($4^{3ff.}$). But the doctrine becomes most explicit in the Fourth Gospel.

The farewell address to the Apostles in the Upper Room declares that another Paraclete, or 'Helper,' will take the place of their present

Helper. This 'Spirit of truth' will be unseen and therefore unknown to the world, but will be known to, and remain with, the disciples of Christ ($14^{16.17}$). He will come in Christ's name to teach and to recall all the teaching of Christ (v.^{26}), and to bear witness of Him (15^{26}). He will be given and sent by the Father ($14^{16.26}$), or sent by Christ from the Father, from whom He proceeds (15^{26} 16^{7}). Christ's withdrawal from the world is the condition of His coming, and the apparent loss is real gain (16^{7}). His presence (with the disciples) will conclusively convince the world that their unbelief in Christ is sin, that Christ's cause has been vindicated by His ascent to the Father, and that the sentence of Divine judgment has already been pronounced on the arch-enemy of Christ, the Satanic ruler of the world (16^{8-11}). It has been necessary for Christ to leave much unsaid, but His successor will guide the disciples into all the truth, being Himself the Spirit of truth. His teaching is not, however, independent of Christ's, but its complement, deriving from Christ Himself, and opening the future; His work will glorify Christ (16^{12-14}). The significant feature in all this teaching is that the activity of the Spirit is confined in its direct operation to the Church, enabling it to win its victory over the world; there is no thought of the Spirit working directly on the hearts of sinful men to bring them to Christ; if the unbeliever is convinced it will be after the fashion of the Corinthian meeting, where the testimony of a Christian 'prophet' will bring him to faith by revealing the secrets of his heart (so E. F. Scott, *The Fourth Gospel*, p. 337). The Spirit is conceived as the projected presence and activity of Christ Himself with His Church, and this explains the personalization of the conception. The communal activity of the Holy Spirit here begins to be ecclesiasticized, though such a word really does violence to the fluidity of Johannine mysticism. How far, then, has the Bible brought us towards the Trinitarian doctrine of the fourth century? The answer to this will be given by our exegesis of the Pauline benediction in 2 Co 13^{14} (for by this we shall construe the more enigmatic, and probably later, baptismal formula of Mt 28^{19}). 'The fellowship of the Holy Spirit' is most naturally taken as an activity of the Spirit comparable with and resulting from the active grace of Christ and the active love of God which is expressed in and through that grace (cf. Ro 15^{30}, 'the love of, *i.e.* produced by, the Spirit'). The fellowship is a fellowship with God through Christ mediated by or in the Holy Spirit, so agreeing exactly with the teaching of Eph 2^{18}: 'through him (Christ) we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father.' There is certainly no warrant for the interpretation 'fellowship *with* the Holy Spirit,' as distinguished from the Father and the Son; nor does it satisfy the parallel members of the Benediction (always important for Hebrew or Hebraized thought) to make κοινωνία mean simply the fellowship with men created by the Spirit, *i.e.* the Church. Thus the triple Benediction is simply a more explicit form of that which Paul uses elsewhere, 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ be with you all.' When that is said, all is said, for the grace of Christ implies the love of God behind it, and the fellowship (of the whole group) with God created by the Spirit through that grace.

Inevitably, we are left asking further questions about the Holy Spirit which the Bible will not answer for us, questions which have emerged in subsequent discussion, questions which do not belong to historical exegesis at all. We must always recognize that the thought-world of an ancient document cannot possibly be ours, and that the writers were content to leave many problems unsolved, because those problems had not risen upon their horizon. Just as the Apostle Paul seems to have had no difficulty in postulating the pre-existence and the post-existence of Christ, alongside the Father and sharing His nature, though subordinate to Him, so he comes to intellectual equilibrium in the thought of the real presence of that Christ in the believer's heart and life by the indwelling Spirit. To treat this presence as the 'influence' of a vague and semi-physical *something* is altogether to miss the truth; for Paul life is so identified with Christ that to live is Christ, and the fellowship of the Spirit is intensely personal, with nothing between the believer and his Lord. Yet, on the other hand, to think that we can therefore leave out the Spirit, as some tacitly do, is to forget that cardinal utterance of Paul's—'the Lord the Spirit.' No mere historical figure of the past could ever have entered into the Apostle's thought and experience as did the living Christ. If the Lord gave personality to the Spirit, the Spirit gave ubiquity to the Lord. If the Divine Fatherhood and Sonship gave to the Spirit a new content of truth, the Spirit (by the very use and meaning of the term) opened up new avenues of inquiry, new fields of speculation about personality in man and in God which are very far from being yet exhausted. The glory of the Bible doctrine of the Holy Spirit is that it compels us to seek its meaning in the larger book of human history and human thought, to which all the nations of the earth contribute.

Literature.

THE RISE OF GENTILE CHRISTIANITY.

In his new book, *The Rise of Gentile Christianity* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 7s. 6d. net), Professor F. J. Foakes-Jackson, of Union Theological Seminary, New York, seeks to present the early story of the Christian Church uncontroversially to highly educated Jews (who composed the audiences to whom the lectures contained in the book were delivered), in the hope that Jew and Christian 'may once more unite in the noblest of all efforts, that of bringing man to love and obey God.' Dr. Foakes-Jackson, who is peculiarly suited for the task he has set before him, makes much of the point that the real battle between Judaism and Christianity, whether during the ministry of Jesus or in the early Church, was not a battle of opinions, but the question of observing the Law. From the first the Jews felt that the Christians were indifferent to the Divine commands. On the other hand, the Christians laid great stress on the importance of right belief.

The scope of Dr. Foakes-Jackson's work may be gathered from the statement that it begins with John the Baptist and ends with Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and Origen. There was nothing, he says, in the teaching of Jesus incompatible with the best side of Judaism. Though Paul constantly contended against the Judaizing Christians, his mind was characteristically Jewish. James the Lord's brother was probably more Jewish than Christian, Peter more Christian than Jewish. John 'the disciple whom Jesus loved,' though himself a Jew, was almost entirely Christian, and indeed the real founder of dogmatic Christianity, as opposed to Judaism. But Dr. Foakes-Jackson himself does not appear to be in much sympathy with the effort of dogmatic Christianity. At any rate, he says that it would be well if Christians would try more to follow in the steps of Jesus Christ than to define what should be believed concerning the mystery of His nature.

THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT.

It is not too much to affirm that no volume, of recent years at least, has more penetratingly and persuasively presented the mind of Christ in the Sermon on the Mount than this volume, *The Sermon on the Mount for To-day* (T. & T. Clark ; 7s. 6d. net), by the Rev. T. H. Wright, minister of The Scots Church in Paris. Mr. Wright's former books, 'The Finger of God,' and 'The Shrine of Faith,' prepare a reader for the distinctive and pellucid English, the balance of the sentences and the fine taste of the illustrations—showing the author's wide reading and catholic mind. In the Introduction Mr. Wright discusses the questions which touch on the religious thought of the time of Christ's ministry, with a chapter of much value on the apocalyptic outlook. Then, with an interpreting sympathy, he presents the features of the Christian saint of the Beatitudes. In this the preacher moves with ease. As he passes on to the more difficult and often questioned counsels of Jesus on the conduct of life, the note of balance, matched by a finely touched moral and spiritual enthusiasm, is most impressive. It has been said by more than one critic that Christian men to-day are not taking Jesus seriously, and that the average preacher explains away many of Christ's counsels of perfection. But Mr. Wright sets them in clear light, accepts their call to the moral heights of a life hid with Christ, and persuades his readers to a new endeavour to attain to their flawless nobility. The closing section on the Urgency of Jesus is engrossing in every line.

PERSONALISM.

If it were only for the fine tribute to the memory of Dr. Borden P. Bowne, *The Philosophy of Personalism*, by the Rev. Albert C. Knudson, Theol.D., LL.D. (Abingdon Press ; $3.50), would be sure of a welcome from all philosophical theologians.

We can recall the late Principal Iverach recommending Dr. Bowne's works—at a time when pragmatism was regarded as the typical American philosophy—as being perhaps the sanest and the most synoptic product of American thought. The private letters from Pringle-Pattison (p. 63) and William James (p. 405) given in this volume are a proof of the respect in which Bowne was held by competent thinkers. It is therefore good news to learn that a biography is in preparation, for we confess to lean to the belief that a man's philosophy depends on the kind of man the philosopher is, and so we wish to know the facts of Dr. Bowne's life. But on its own merits this volume is worthy of praise. Its candour and courtesy, even when demolishing criticism is necessary, are captivating, and the adequate scholarship and fine temper of

the author are evidenced on every page and are a credit to American learning.

The author's thesis is that personality is the key to reality and the central and organizing principle of a true philosophy, and he elaborates this thesis historically and critically in the spheres of epistemology (ch. II.), ontology (ch. III.), and religion (ch. IV.), defining in chapter I. what personality means, and defending (ch. V.) personalism from misconceptions and misconsequences. While in very general agreement with the author, we find ourselves raising a caveat against certain points, two of which only can be mentioned here.

(1) We think it difficult to harmonize a belief in temporal creation with the belief in the eternity of the world (p. 329). The first, if it means anything, implies that there was a time when the world was not, and the second implies existence (eternal), a *parte ante* as well as a *parte post*. Recent speculation on this matter, making the world as essential to God as God is to it, makes us very doubtful of the whole position. A thorough discussion of the theological implications of the denial of creation is, in our opinion, one of the desiderata of modern theology.

(2) Whatever may be said of a human self 'perfectly impervious to other selves,' to use the words of Pringle-Pattison, quoted with approval by the author (he should perhaps have mentioned that Pringle-Pattison has, to a large extent, modified that earlier view of his), we cannot think of God's relation to the souls He has made after that fashion, for in Him we live and move and have our being. In any theory of reality, however much we may wish to safeguard man's individuality, we cannot do so by threatening God's absoluteness and immanence. A created and dependent self or selves can never be the measure of all things—of things that are that they are or things that are not that they are not. This individualistic pelagianism, even if you raise it into a metaphysical synergism, will never satisfy the religious spirit, and without doubt this is the Achilles' heel of any form of personalism.

While pointing out these weaknesses of which the author is well aware, and which he tries to meet, we feel constrained to express our appreciation both of the matter and spirit of this volume, which we regard as a serious and solid contribution to current thought.

THE SACRAMENTAL SOCIETY.

The Rev. C. Ryder Smith, B.A., D.D., of the Methodist College, Richmond, is well known as a student and interpreter of Biblical doctrine, and in *The Sacramental Society* (Epworth Press ; 5s. net), being the Fernley Lecture for 1927, he expounds the sacramental principle from the evangelical standpoint. The exposition is on popular lines, and abounds in illustrative matter. First the Christian use of the symbolic and the sacramental is compared and contrasted with other uses. Then the attitude of the Bible to ritual is set forth. Here the distinction is made between the terms 'essential' and 'obligatory,' and the use of symbol represented as essential to societies, but not the use of any particular symbol, particular symbols being only obligatory. The central discussion of the book is on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The Sacramental School of interpreters holds that the New Testament accepts the Old Testament teaching which made the spiritual fundamental in religion, and denies that any particular ritual observance is authoritative or obligatory. The Sacerdotalist School holds that the New Testament repudiates the teaching in question, and affirms that a given ritual is essential to Christianity. As against this Dr. Ryder Smith holds it to be the general assumption of the New Testament that the teaching of the Old Testament is valid, and that the general attitude of the New Testament should carry great weight in the interpretation of Baptism and the Eucharist. His final discussion is on the bearing of the conclusions reached on the subjects of Church Membership, Inter-Communion, and Christian Reunion. On two questions of the hour, namely, our Lord's relation to the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist as institutions of the Apostolic Church, and the influence of the Mystery Religions upon the belief and practice of the Apostolic Church, Dr. Ryder Smith has little or nothing to say.

ENGLISH GOTHIC CHURCHES.

To write for the layman a concise and readable text-book that shall deal satisfactorily with the works of any period of architecture is a more difficult task than it may seem. When the attempt has been made, too commonly it has failed. Books intended to interest and instruct the general public in architecture have been written by architects, by antiquarians, and by lay amateurs of the art. Of the three resultant types of book, the first, as far as its lay audience is concerned, is ineffective, the second dull, and the third largely irrelevant. Dr. Budden's volume, *English Gothic Churches : The Story of their Architecture* (Batsford ;

7s. 6d. net), falls into none of these categories. Its author, whilst not an architect, has an expert's knowledge of his subject. His book is the fruit of exhaustive and original research and bears checking upon small points of fact as few such books will. It manages vividly to relate the architecture of the period with which it is concerned to the religious and social life and ideas of the age. At the same time it presents that architecture as an art primarily of design conceived in certain materials and profoundly influenced by the nature of those materials. But the thing for which the layman will be chiefly grateful to Dr. Budden is his rare capacity for making clear the most intricate aspects of the architecture of the English Parish Church. The section in which he deals with the development of vaulting is a conspicuous example of the clarity of his method.

Hitherto, in the smaller text-books, the growth of mediæval architecture in England has been represented as an affair of sharply divided phases. Here we have the development revealed as it really occurred. It is not simply traced in general outline. Each separate feature of the vernacular Gothic is treated by itself, so that it is possible to follow in their proper order the changes of form through which doorways and porches, windows, arcades, vaults, roofs, towers and spires passed.

The study of the English Parish Church is notably advanced in one important direction. For the first time the geographical distribution of the chief types of church has been established by the author. Dr. Budden has discovered that there were certain zones in which particular plans, shapes, materials, and methods of construction were developed. He has established the distinguishing characteristics of each type, and has determined the regional boundaries within which it is to be found. A new and important light is thus shed upon the history of the Parish Church in England.

The book is copiously illustrated by excellent photographs and line drawings, and is small enough to be conveniently carried in the pocket. A further practical merit is the provision in the final chapter of a list showing where the best examples of parish church architecture are to be found in England. In these days when the motor-car has opened up the whole countryside and the remotest village churches are becoming the subject of renewed interest, this should prove a feature of exceptional usefulness.

CAIN AND SARGON I.

Some writers, in their efforts to uphold the historical accuracy of the first chapters of Genesis, endeavour to support their argument from archæological discoveries in Babylonia. This is what Mrs. Sydney Bristowe has done in her new book, *Sargon the Magnificent* (Covenant Publishing Co.; 5s. net). She claims that Cain fled from Canaan to Babylonia ('the land of Nod'), where, owing to 'his superhuman knowledge and power,' he became supreme ruler and none other than Sargon, the historic King of Agade. In his flight, he had taken with him the early stories of Genesis, such as those of the Creation of the World, the Garden of Eden, and the Flood, but the Babylonian priests, in their hatred to the truth, wilfully distorted them, giving them the mythological character they bear in the inscriptions. The author gives no proof for the identity of Cain with Sargon, except that the former may have been alive when the latter reigned, that the name Cain may be found in the name Sargon (*Sharru-Kin*, 'King Cain'), and that the city of Erech or Unug in Babylonia was probably the one that Cain built in memory of his son Enoch. Needless to say, these arguments have no historical basis. The date which the author gives to Cain (*c.* 3800 B.C.) is very far from coinciding with that ascribed by Assyriologists to Sargon (*c.* 2850 B.C.); and as for the city of Erech, if Cain was Sargon, it could not have been built by him. Indeed, it was one of the cities conquered by Sargon, and was in existence ages before his time, for no less than five dynasties are believed to have ruled there sometime between 5000 and 4000 B.C. Nor can its Sumerian name, Unug, be derived from Enoch; it is believed rather to be compounded of *Unu*, 'dwelling,' and the Elamitic-Sumerian locative ending *-ak*. The author adopts the view that the black race is not of common origin with the white one, but was a separate creation before Adam, and that it was among those black pre-Adamites (whom she identifies with the Sumerians) that Cain settled. This accounts, she tells us, for his absolute mastery over them and his great renown in history, as well as solves the Sumerian language problem on lines similar to those adopted by the Halévyan School. It is a pity that the writer, in her desire to save Genesis, as she thinks, from the hands of the Higher Critics, should put forward such absurdities, which are inconsistent with the oneness of the human race, the great antiquity of man, and the late compilation of the Old Testament. As the author's particular object is to prove that the

Genesis stories were not derived from Babylonian myths, it is well to remember that faith in the Divine Revelation contained in the Old Testament does not depend on a comparison of the Biblical and Babylonian versions of the early legends. Probably both versions had a common origin among the Semites, but nothing of consequence would be lost whatever view of the question be taken. So far as the book is an effort to counteract Pan-Babylonian theories, its motive is commendable, and it contains some interesting quotations from leading Assyrian scholars.

THE SPIRITUAL AIM.

A book on religious education that is both wise and well-informed is rather a treasure. Not all (not by any means all) the books on this subject that are being issued in such large numbers are really of much use. But one of the most recent is also one of the best—*Purpose in Teaching Religion*, by Professor George W. Fiske, of Oberlin School of Theology (Abingdon Press; $1.75). It is up to date in its knowledge of method, but it is also wise and cautious in its handling of method. It is, for example, pleasant to note that every new idea in religious education is examined as to its fitness to promote the spiritual factor. Professor Fiske is rightly jealous of any method that is merely educational and modern. He asks more than once, 'Are we losing the spiritual aim with all our new methods?' It is a real danger, and one of the most attractive features of this excellent book is its insistent demand that all method must be judged by its contribution to the religious growth of the child.

But the book is not merely a plea for the spiritual element in education. It is a comprehensive survey of the whole subject, and it both lays down principles and applies them in detail. Its standpoint is frankly modern, and the writer is familiar with all that modern pedagogy has to say. There are excellent chapters on 'Dramatics' (the acting of Bible stories by the children) and 'Project Teaching.' There is a fresh and vivid chapter on Jesus as a Teacher. There is nothing, indeed, germane to the subject of religious education that is omitted altogether. But the main value of the book for teachers is that many of them will find here a new point of view and a new inspiration.

THE TWELVE MINOR PROPHETS.

In spite of the excellent work that has been done on The Minor Prophets by Sir George Adam Smith and others, it is to be feared that to many preachers, and certainly to most congregations, they are still a *terra incognita*. Any who desire to begin or to renew their acquaintance with those men who are assuredly 'minor' in nothing but the extent of their literary remains, will find much help and stimulus in the study of *The Twelve Minor Prophets*, by the Rev. Professor G. L. Robinson, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., of McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago. This is essentially a book for preachers as well as for students. The writer takes each of the prophets in turn, sketches the historical background, analyses the prophecy, and brings out its value for the life of to-day. The extensive bibliography appended to each chapter attests Dr. Robinson's long familiarity with the relevant literature, and he names books, both in English and German, such as Dr. Melville Scott's 'Message of Hosea,' which have too often been ignored by those who ought to have considered them. In the light of current critical opinion, Dr. Robinson's treatment of these prophets would be considered conservative: he inclines, for example, to an early date for Joel and to the unity of Zechariah. But there is no bigotry in his discussion, and his arguments show that he is well acquainted with the work of the scholars from whom he feels obliged to dissent. He further brings to his task a first-hand knowledge of the East, and his description of Petra in the discussion of Obadiah has all the vividness of one who has seen the place with his own eyes. Many suggestive remarks are interspersed throughout the book, as, for example, that in Mal 3^{16}, 'we have the germ possibly of the later synagogue.' Considering the prevalent tendency to dissect the prophets and to relegate not inconsiderable sections of them to late and sometimes very late dates, a cordial welcome should be extended to a book which is written in a spirit of sane, unprejudiced, and open-eyed conservatism. The book is published at $2.00 net by the George H. Doran Company, New York.

THE TIBETAN BOOK OF THE DEAD.

Every one knows the great Egyptian classic of this name, but how many have heard of *The Tibetan Book of the Dead*? It is a work worth studying. And here it comes (Oxford University Press; 16s. net) in a beautiful form, with impressive illustrations, and an illuminating foreword of eighteen pages by Sir John Woodroffe, the Tantric scholar. It has been translated by the late Kazi Dawa-Samdup, who, we are told, 'combined in

himself a greater knowledge of the Occult Sciences of Tibet and of Western Science than any Tibetan scholar of this epoch'; and who certainly possessed many high qualifications for his task. The editor is Mr. W. Y. Evans-Wentz, M.A., D.Litt., B.Sc., of Jesus College, Oxford, who has spent years in a romantic search for truth in the cities and the lonely places of the East, eagerly seeking out all likely teachers.

It is a remarkable book. Every one knows the importance attached by Buddhism to what happens in the mind at the hour of death. This is an effort to help the dying at death, and after death; to assist them to choose aright in the many bewilderments that will come upon them. At first the dead are not aware that they are dead; they possess a thought body which resembles their material one; and only slowly do they awaken to the fact that they are in the intermediate state. Once there, one is given the chance of choosing the great Reality; but too many feel a craving for the old material body and its life, and drift back to a new existence here or elsewhere. The book is a passionately earnest endeavour to assist the soul, as we would say, not to do this, to help it too at the terrible moment of judgment, and in the last resort, if it insists on coming back, to enable it to choose a body wisely. There is an impressive judgment scene; and the appeals made to 'the soul' are often very moving. There are, of course, singular parallels to much that is in people's mouths to-day—to Freud, for example, at his weirdest and to much modern occult talk; for there is nothing new under the sun. This is an interesting book, a little biased against Christianity. Indeed, our only doubt is whether one who is so pathetically external in his treatment of Christianity has really grasped the inner spirit of the other faith, or whether he is as haphazard about it. A Christian man puts down this book with an immense thankfulness for his own faith.

It is one of the signs both of the ethical uncertainty of the present day, and of the assurance of the supreme masterhood of Jesus, that Christian preachers are turning, with desire, to a fresh interpretation of the teaching of Jesus. Here, in *The Sermon on the Mount*, by the Rev. Geoffrey Wardle Stafford (Abingdon Press; $1.75), we have a study of Christ's moral ideal in its most conspicuous presentation. Neither the title, nor the sub-title, 'The Charter of Christianity,' indicates the preacher's precise subject. These sermons deal only with Mt 5^{1-20}. Their subject is, most naturally, the Christian character, as it is portrayed in the opening verses of this most treasured portion of the Sermon. The preacher is steadfastly true both to his lineage and his subject. As a son of Dr. Wardle Stafford of Toronto, known on both sides of the Atlantic, and in the line of theological descent from John Wesley, the evangelic note is heard most clearly. The style is always clear, simple, terse, with the effective power of the short sentence and the emphatic noun. The language is that of the home and the market-place. The citations indicate an observant mind. As one reads, the note of personal appeal gives one almost to hear the preacher's voice. But the most notable feature of these addresses is the analysis of the elements of the Christian character, as it is drawn in the lines of the Beatitudes. In that regard we have a most engaging presentation, as Dr. Parkes Cadman suggests, in his Foreword, of American preaching in its persuasive directness and its insistence on reality.

In *The Appeal to Reality* (Abingdon Press; $1.00) Mr. R. Edis. Fairbairn deals capably, readably, and suggestively with some of the most pressing questions for the preacher in our time. There is, he holds, a demand for 'reality,' but some are not very sure as to what they mean by reality. Often the word stands just for earnestness and sincerity. The author uses it to represent 'that which is real, the world of things as they are.' And in his view all hope for religion, as for anything else, depends upon our discovery of and faithful dealing with reality. That seems obvious enough, but the book is much more than an exposition of the obvious. One of the best things in it, and one which needs to be emphasized in our time, is the contention that 'the Gospel can never cease to stand upon its historical basis. Without a recognition of that connection with reality, Christianity is apt to decline upon a pious sentimentalism.'

What is Left of the Apostles' Creed? (Abingdon Press; $1.00) is the somewhat misleading title of a new book by the Rev. Loren M. Edwards, D.D., of Trinity Church, Denver. Instead of the critical discussion of the doctrines of the Apostles' Creed we might expect to find here, we find a practical or homiletical exposition of some of the essential doctrines of the Christian Faith, their place in the Apostles' Creed being little more than indicated.

The style is expressive and often eloquent, the standpoint conservative but not narrowly so, and the treatment positive. The six chapters treat successively of God the Almighty Father, Jesus the Divine Lord, The Holy Spirit, The Church, The Forgiveness of Sins, and Life Everlasting.

Jesus as a Philosopher is the title given to a series of Wireless Talks which were given during 1925–26 by Dr. Herman Harrell Horne, who is Professor of the Philosophy of Education in New York University (Abingdon Press; $1.00). These talks were eminently suited to their purpose, and they embraced a large number of subjects. 'The series,' Dr. Horne says, 'might be called "Every Man's Philosophy," since every man of moment is interested in the teachings of Jesus, has a country, wants to be happy, follows a business of some kind, is trying to win success in life, has some anticipation of what lies beyond death, is becoming educated either in school or in the experiences of life, has friends, is interested in the young people of this changing generation, and is concerned about eugenics. These are the topics treated in our radio lectures.'

We have received *The Epistle to the Romans*, by the Rev. W. P. Goard (Covenant Publishing Co.; 2s. 6d. net). It is an analysis of the Epistle from the British-Israel point of view.

The theory that the Anglo-Saxon race is the lineal descendant of ancient Israel and the heir of the promises has in recent times produced a somewhat considerable literature, most of which it is difficult to read with patience. *The Wonder Race*, by Mr. G. E. Altree Coley (Covenant Publishing Co.; 5s. net), is, however, written with much sanity and restraint. Not that anything like historic and convincing proof of the main thesis is offered, but extravagances are avoided, and a high moral and Christian tone is maintained throughout. The concluding chapter, 'What shall we do about it?' points to the main blots on the face of our social system, and urges that our race should strive to prove itself more worthy of its high destiny. With this conclusion no one will be at variance.

Can psychology be taught to teachers? It is hardly likely that the course on psychology which teachers attend in their period of training can be of very material service to them. Many of them are quite unfitted to profit by it, because they have had no introduction to the subject at all. But a good deal can be done if the instruction is simple enough and illustrated by familiar instances. And these requirements are met in a book which is by a skilled teacher of psychology who has the gift of popular exposition and particularly the aptitude for concrete illustration. And so we heartily commend *An ABC of Psychology for Sunday School Workers and Bible Students*, by Professor Eric S. Waterhouse, Professor of Psychology and Philosophy at Richmond College, Surrey (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). The book is an admirable compendium of the most salient facts to which psychology has lately drawn fresh attention. Professor Waterhouse is by no means a slave to the 'new psychology.' He accepts its conclusions with caution and many of its inferences he would reject. But he certainly harnesses the teachings of psychology to an excellent teaching aim. So far as we can learn psychology at all from books, teachers will learn from this one. And as Professor Waterhouse always has his eye on the object, and continually bears the teacher and the scholar in mind, the teacher will find many valuable hints for his own work. The book is written very simply, but it is written with full knowledge and a really helpful skill. Any one who does not learn from this guide must be dull indeed. There is, by the way, an admirable chapter on Jesus as a Teacher, in which the writer shows how Jesus anticipated the theory and practice of the modern psychologist.

The Minister among his People, by the Rev. W. Deane, B.D. (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net), is a book of 'practical hints on pastoral psychology.' The writer's belief is that 'pastoral work offers the choicest opportunities to those who make it a divine study, and that the richest results would accrue to the Church were all her ministers to concentrate on this sacred department of her task.' He has made a close study of human nature as 'the material on which the pastor works,' and he gives us here, in twenty brief chapters, the results of his observation and experience. The book, though not profound, is extremely readable and full of sound sense and helpful suggestion.

We welcome a volume of sermons with the title *God's Message* (Epworth Press; 5s. net). They are the work of that saintly scholar, the late Professor George G. Findlay, B.A., D.D., for almost thirty years tutor in the Wesleyan College at Headingley, Leeds. In 'The Christian Year' we have quoted one of the sermons so that those who do not know the force and simplicity of his message

may gain some knowledge of it. The preface of the volume is a biographical sketch by his eldest daughter, Mary G. Findlay, D.Sc. It is an admirably balanced sketch, bringing out his tireless industry and his exact scholarship. We could wish Miss Findlay had allowed herself more scope so that those who did not know Professor Findlay might have had a fuller picture of him. Writing in 1893, he says of himself: 'I am a son of the Conference. I learnt from my father, and in his person to revere the Methodist ministry. . . . The Conference has made me a tutor to its young men. I have loved my work and lived for it. But I have striven first and last, amid much unworthiness and infirmity, to be a true preacher of the gospel of the grace of God; and the Cross of Christ is my glory and joy.'

The Doctrines of Jesus, by the Rev. W. H. B. Gibbon, B.D. (Epworth Press; 3s. net), is a short study of the synoptic teaching on such themes as God, Sin, Salvation, and the Person of Christ. In a foreword the writer very truly remarks that 'it becomes increasingly difficult to justify any one who attempts to produce another book on this well-worked theme, and one can only urge the intrinsic importance of the synoptic message.' His book is aimed at the general reader rather than the student of theology. It is well informed and concisely written, but the plough does not turn a very deep furrow. There is little sense conveyed of the overplus which more than exhausts all theories, and the reader is left wondering whether the mystery of God in man can really be made to fit so easily into our categories.

A volume containing much valuable information for Old Testament students is *A Study of Races in the Ancient Near East* (Heffer; 8s. 6d. net), by Professor W. H. Worrell, teacher of Semitic and other languages in the University of Michigan. It includes a study not only of the most important historical peoples of the Old Testament, but also of the Hamitic and Hamitoid groups of Africa. The author deals in an original and accurate way with the religious traditions which touch the world through Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, and in particular with the phonology and syntax of language as reflected in racial admixture, and as an index of the extent and character of racial contamination. The main difficulty, in a proper treatment of this subject, lies in the fact that races are related to one another in body, language, and culture, and that classification in one of these ways does not necessarily coincide with classification in the others. The author, however, is alive to this fact and deals with its intricacies. Most Semitic scholars will differ from his view that the Semitic language is a specialized form of Hamitic. While admitting the fundamental relationship between the two, they prefer to believe that the grammatical structure and morphology of the former were borrowed by African peoples, including the Egyptians. But the author gives facts which seem to show that in Hamitic we have the survival of conditions more primitive than those to be found in Semitic. The statement (p. 111) that the Phœnician alphabet first appears at about 1000 B.C. is incorrect: one inscription at least, the Ahiram one, in Phœnician letters, dates from about 1250 B.C. Although the volume has occasional technical discussions, the presentation of the facts has been put in an interesting and popular form. In the discussion of speech-sounds, the subject has been made easier to the general reader by the employment of the symbols of the International Phonetic Association, a complete list of which is given. In regard to the Christian religion, the book takes up a somewhat agnostic tone, but on racial questions it is very informative and should be helpful to Old Testament study.

The practice of dramatizing Bible stories as part of the expression work of a class in school is spreading, and its value for teaching is being widely recognized. We have not yet perhaps as much guidance as we need in the actual practice of the art. But all that helps is welcome, and the Rev. Alfred Clegg has done a useful piece of work in his *Narrative Dialogues from the Bible*, arranged for Sunday schools and classes (Heffer; 6s. net). The author has adopted a skilful device for helping the representation. He has not only the characters in the story, but 'the narrator' also, who helps to fill the gaps and to give the setting and to introduce the characters. He acts as a kind of Greek chorus, but his words are the actual words of the Scripture narrative. The value of this device would be found in practice. We confess it does not seem to be always a success. But in any case these narrative dialogues will give ample material and guidance to teachers in the practice of Bible 'dramatics.' There is a threefold index—Subject, Topical, and Biblical.

Confucius is no great favourite in the West, upon the ground that he is stiff and formal and humourless. But this is largely a misapprehension,

due to the pedantic translations of the past, which modern scholars, like Mr. Leonard A. Lyall, are doing their best to dissipate. He has now issued *The Chung-Yung*—the digest of the sage's teachings upon conduct and life which his grandson made some two thousand five hundred years ago, fearful that in that period of wild upheaval, when the old order of things was passing everywhere, the great moral teachings that his ancestor so loved and so assiduously gathered together, might be lost. In point of fact his own book was practically buried out of sight for over a thousand years. But for centuries *The Chung-Yung* has held a high place among the Chinese Classics. It is a treatise on how the mind in the babble of common life can hold a central place between the spirit and the body, and keep the latter in obedience to the spirit's promptings. There are only twenty-four pages of it, together with an introduction by King Chien-Kün, a young Chinese scholar. The publishers are Messrs. Longmans, Green & Co., and the price is 6s. net.

Memories of the Mission Field, by Christine I. Tinling (Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net), is the work of one who has travelled widely in both the Near and the Far East, and who has already written interestingly on missionary work. The present book which deals mainly, though not exclusively, with China, may be taken as a series of snap-shots—taken here and there in the mission field. They are done with vividness, insight, and sympathy. In one respect they may be regarded as somewhat out of date in that they take no account of the present chaos in China, but it is the writer's conviction that 'the work so sadly interrupted will in due course be resumed, and that this crisis will turn out after all to the furtherance of the Gospel.' The book is warmly commended in a foreword by Dr. F. B. Meyer.

The modesty of the title of the Rev. Charles Harris's new book, *First Steps in the Philosophy of Religion* (S.C.M.; 4s. net), disarms criticism, so that if we find here good milk for babes we cannot rightly complain at the absence of solid meat for the strong.

Dr. Harris is evidently writing for the large class of students who have few opportunities of a decent and respectable acquaintance with philosophical and theological literature, but who are intelligently and seriously interested in the problems of religion and who know in a vague way the supposed difficulties of a religious view of life. For such this book may be helpful in showing how much can on rational grounds be said for religion, and how specious and self-contradictory often are the arguments against it. If it gains an initial hearing from those for whom it was written it may lead them on to higher things.

The body of the book is an attempt to state in modern form and for modern needs the arguments for God's existence and character as a foundation for Christianity. While there is little novelty in the treatment there is clarity and cogency, but we regret the passing over by the author of the so-called 'ontological argument.'

Whether Dr. Harris omits it because of his respect for Aquinas, or because of the obvious difficulty of stating it satisfactorily, we cannot say, but an argument that appealed with force to Anselm, Descartes, Leibniz, and Hegel deserves a word even in a work of this kind. We confess our inability to see the relevancy or congruity of the Anglo-Catholic apologia and eirenicon at the beginning, or of the Apotheosis Excursus or Pride Sermon at the end of the volume with the main thesis of the book. They are interesting, but they do not cohere, and we think this little volume would be as well without them.

Adoption and Redemption in the Beloved.

A STUDY OF EPHESIANS I. 5–7.

By the Reverend H. J. Flowers, B.D., Chorley Wood, Herts.

It is the misfortune of Paul to have suffered perhaps more than any other writer or teacher at the hands of commentators. Primarily, he was a missionary of Jesus Christ, the chosen vessel of God to proclaim the message of salvation to the Gentiles. His Christianity and his apostleship were bound up together. It was as a Christian and a missionary that he would have desired to be judged by his fellows. But rarely has Paul been taken at his own valuation. Some of the early

Christians judged him as a heretic, and the Church ever since has judged him as a theologian. It is only in comparatively recent years that he has begun to come into his own, and be regarded as a missionary and a man. He rarely wrote theology, but his Epistles have often been read as though they contained nothing else but theology.

Paul was a live sort of person. He always made an effort to speak in language understood of the people. He was broad-minded and determined to be all things to all men in his effort to save all. He was adamant on a few fundamental facts, the facts which he thought to constitute the gospel; and in the acceptance of those facts he was at one with the earliest Apostles, but he exercised great freedom in the interpretation of them. He would obey no law *as law*, except the law of Christ, but he would do many things because of the weakness of his brethren. In the preaching of his message, he seized every idea that came along that was good in itself or suggestive, and used it as a starting-point for delivering his own message. He adopted the terms that were in the air. He breathed the atmosphere of his age. As a missionary in many lands, he knew all the currents of thought that were sweeping men along. Though he breathed the atmosphere of the time, it does not follow that he was asphyxiated by its poison. Though he used words that were current in the religious literature of the time, it does not follow that he adopted all the ideas for which those words stood. One of the hardest tasks of the expositor is to judge between what is essential and what is superficial in the teaching of Paul, between what is matter and what is mere wrapping. A good deal in the past has been classed as Paulinism which we know now to have been the common property of the ancient world. But, on the other hand, at the present time, there is a tendency to scrap much of Paul, because he interprets Christ in the language of his own day. Paul may use the language of the Mysteries, but that does not necessarily prove that he interprets Christianity as a Mystery religion.

These warnings must always be borne in mind. They are more than ever relevant when we are studying this particular section of the letter to the Ephesians. It will be noticed that three broad ideas rise out of it. They are: (1) The eternal purpose of God in Jesus Christ; (2) Christianity as the adoption of men by God; (3) Redemption in the blood of Christ. We will take up these points one by one.

I.

Paul speaks of God as 'having foreordained us unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ unto himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace, which he freely bestowed on us in the beloved.' There are isolated words and phrases here which are difficult, but they need not keep us very long. When Paul says, for example, that God 'foreordained men to adoption according to the good pleasure of his will,' he is simply declaring in a very emphatic way that all the blessings of salvation are the result of the absolutely free will and grace of God. Human desert has nothing whatever to do with it. There is no compulsion operating upon the mind of God from the outside, no external law that He has to obey, no bargain that He has to keep. Redemptive grace is the mainspring of God's activity. If it ceases to operate, God ceases to exist.

Further, προορίσας looks back to definite events. The plan of God for human life was made long ago, before we as individuals were here or the world as a whole was called into life. The purpose of God to redeem the race is not contingent upon any other facts: it is bound up with the whole constitution of the universe. Nothing can turn it back. The whole of history is conspiring towards a day when Christ shall die and, by His death, bring back the wandering children of men to the knowledge of their sonship of God. There is no real voice in history but the voice of God. And that voice has always been speaking in love.

Paul emphasizes the free grace of God again in the words, 'to the praise of the glory of his grace which he freely bestowed on us in the beloved.' Evidently Paul is dealing with people who dispute the absolute Divine origin of salvation and interpret it synergistically as the result of the co-operation between the will of God and that of men. Or it may be that he is so enraptured that he can hardly contain himself. Anyhow, for whatever reason, he piles up word upon word and thought upon thought to show the goodness of God. It would not have worried him if you had thrown at him his own demand for faith, or his command that we should work out our own salvation with fear and trembling. For he would quickly have turned the tables by saying that it was only by the Divine grace that any one has the power of responding to the Divine grace.

We are brought up here face to face with one of the boldest pieces of Paul's thought, the idea of Christ as the goal and object of the universe, as the

one through whom God has determined from the very beginning of time to save the world. It is obvious to the most unsophisticated reader of the New Testament that this is an addition to the message of Jesus as it was preached in Galilee. Jesus certainly looked upon the world as religious, ruled over by a fatherly and loving providence who made all things work together to the ultimate good of those who loved God. Further, He held in His mind at once the two ideas of Divine predestination and human free will, as both being necessary parts in a sensible view of the universe, without, however, seeing how they contradicted each other and most assuredly without making any attempt to force them into line with each other. He also looked upon Himself as foretold by the prophets: He was the Messiah. But so far as we can judge, that is as far as He went. But Paul goes much further. The gospel of Jesus has first gone through the crucible of Paul's rabbinic training, and then through that of his experience of heathen thought and practice. The one unshakable fact, however, of Paul's gospel is that in Jesus Christ, and supremely in His death and resurrection, God redeems the race from sin, and that by the bestowal of the Holy Spirit, the believer is enabled to enter into newness of life. That gospel he shares with the early Church, and it never alters through all the forms in which he interprets it. He may use the Mysteries and he may use other things, but they do not affect the core of the gospel: they are little more or less than the perishable forms of its expression.

In common with all the early Church, Paul speaks of the Christ. But the word has practically ceased to be descriptive of a function, and has almost become a personal name. It is doubtful whether Paul was conscious of putting into it a different meaning from what he put into the name Jesus or the combination of names Jesus Christ. A good deal of ingenuity has been spent on trying to show that by the name *Jesus*, Paul refers to the historic person, the man of Galilee; by the name *Christ*, the eternal Son of God who reigns now in heaven; and by the combination *Jesus Christ*, the Incarnation. Paul is guilty of no such subtlety. He uses the names much as we do, without being conscious which we use and without implying much difference between them. He speaks of Jesus as the *Beloved*. That is a Messianic title, at any rate, in the early Church. But Paul does not mean anything Messianic by it, at least in the ordinary sense of the term. He is referring to Jesus as the one who dwells eternally at the centre of God's heart of love, and through whom we share in everything we mean by the grace of God.

There is an increasing cry to-day that we must get back to Jesus and to the simple gospel of Galilee. Within reason, that is a sound cry. But the difficulty is that the simple gospel of Jesus, if there was ever such a thing, has gone beyond recall. For the Gospels themselves are the product of the Church and have passed through the crucible of an experience which has made Jesus Himself, and not merely something that He preached, to be the central fact of the Christian message. Through the work of the Church, Jesus the preacher has become Jesus the Risen Lord, and as Risen Lord, the triumphant Son of God, and as that He appears to us in the pages of the Evangelists. It may be possible to clear away the accretions of later theology, and to reach the pure truth as it came from the Master's lips, but the results arrived at will always be dependent upon the idiosyncrasy of the individual critic, and will not be big enough to save the world. The fact remains that whether the message is right or wrong, the message that founded the Church and has redeemed millions is not a message about which Jesus preached, but rather a message preached about Jesus.

The Gospels are only second-hand evidence. Peter and Paul stand nearer to Jesus than do Matthew, Mark, and Luke. And with Paul, it is not a case of following the Prophet of Galilee. He is determined to know Christ after the flesh no longer. Christ is at the very centre of God, regulative of all that we mean by Deity. Jesus had shown Himself to be alive in glory, and that proved at one stroke that the ministry was little more than a vestibule leading to a temple. What though Jesus had not claimed to be this, that, or the other? The fact was that He had made Himself so real to Paul in His appearance from the unseen world that Paul took that experience as a guide to the heart of the gospel and had something more significant than the remembrance of the words said in Galilee and deeds done in Jerusalem. The Christ who was to be merely the fulfilment of the expectations of the Jews had ceased to have any meaning. Paul certainly builds on historic facts. His gospel is a gospel only because certain things happened in space and time. The death and resurrection of Jesus were both real. But the Apocalyptic of the early interpreters of Jesus has no place in Paul. Jesus is not the Son of Man. He is the Son of God, proved to be that by the resurrection from the dead. He is the Servant of Yahweh, exalted to the heavenly places because of what He has suffered

for men. He is the fulfilment of the hope of the world. And so the very ignorance of Paul led to the universalization of the gospel. Fortunately for him and for us, he did not know the prophet of Galilee. He had not been a disciple of Jesus in the flesh. And he knew that he had lost nothing by that. He had met the eternal, heavenly Christ, and he had found that that Christ was his redeemer, and in being his redeemer, was the redeemer of the whole world. In breaking down the power of the national hope, he made Jesus the fulfilment of the hope of the world. He learned much afterwards of the life of Jesus, but the tone of his study had already been set. He had a bias, and his bias was his knowledge of the eternal Christ. That is why the Gospels, which have Pauline influence behind them, have to be read with the greatest circumspection. The temporal is all the time given to us as it is already transfigured by the eternal.

It is one of the most significant elements in modern theology that an attempt is being made seriously to view Jesus as the goal and climax of the moral evolution of the world. What that means for the determination of His own nature, it is hard to say, but Jesus will have to be studied more from this standpoint than has yet been the case. To study Him from the standpoint of the creeds is fatal to the understanding of Him. If necessary, we must be prepared to scrap all the doctrinal development of the ages and start again with the first-hand documents of the New Testament, and work from them. To begin thinking about Jesus with the assumption that He is this and not that is simply to court trouble. We must start with Jesus as we find Him, and from the facts at our disposal, work out what we think is His relation to God, man, and the world. As theologians, we must be loyal followers of the scientific method. But what we must never forget is that we know nothing at all about a prophet of Galilee and His simple message of God's love. The only Jesus we know is a Jesus already interpreted through the eyes of personal faith. There was more in Jesus than appeared on the surface. He was a prophet. He was a Son of Man. He was the crucified. He was the Coming One, to be raised up by God to found the Kingdom. And after His death, He still moved through the activity of the Spirit. He was the High Priest, the Lamb of God, the Light of the World, the Lord, the Logos, the Goal of history. This is all part of our evidence, to be used and interpreted. It is of no use studying Jesus as a mere creature of His time, as a kind of amalgam of prophetism and Essenism. Such a being would never have led to speculation. The problem we must face is the nature of the person who was the product of His time and as human as the rest of us, and yet who was regarded as the Goal of history and the Hope of the world. The Spirit was in all this. Paul had been driven along by the logic of facts to give a cosmic reference to his own personal experience.

II.

Paul says that God has foreordained us 'unto adoption as sons through Jesus Christ.' Christ is God's Son, and through Him we are permitted to enter into sonship. He is the realization of what God intends every one of us to be. That being so, there is implied for Him an outstanding place in the scale of being. What we aim at and miss in the end —indeed, what it will take all Christians together in the unity of the faith to achieve, a perfect man—is the imperishable possession of Jesus, won, it is true, by His own struggling, but at the same time an ethical achievement which implies something metaphysical as well. And then by the word 'adoption' Paul tries to show the high place men win through the work of Christ. In this particular section he gives no theories. In fact, he is in the middle of a doxology, although he has forgotten that fact. All he does here is to bring our adoption into relationship with Christ, and say that through Him we obtain it.

Jesus Himself claimed to be related to God in a unique way. So at least we should judge by the Synoptic Gospels. And the claims of the epistolary literature of the New Testament are so great that it is hard to understand them unless they have warrant in the mind of Jesus. For our evidence we are not confined to the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen and to that remarkable saying, 'No man knoweth the Son, save the Father; and no man knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whom the Son willeth to reveal him.' If this is authentic, and there seems to be no really solid reason for disputing its authenticity, then Jesus is claiming a relationship with God which no other has, and further says that the full knowledge of God which He possesses can be mediated to men only through Him. That is, He provides justification for the thought of Paul, that through Jesus Christ we obtain adoption. But the text has been disputed, and in any case it is not wise to build up much on an isolated text. The whole attitude of Jesus to His fellows, the style of His preaching, the stainlessness of His moral life, or, at least, His complete unconsciousness that there might be stain upon it, His

calm certainty in the presence of God, His grip on eternal truth, His conviction that He was Messiah and Judge, His willingness to give Himself up as a sacrifice for the life of men—all these things together show that He looked upon Himself as specially related to God. But the relation was not merely ethical: Jesus did not claim merely to be better than other men. Neither was it merely official: Jesus did not define His work solely through the medium of Messianism. And yet it seems wooden to bring in metaphysics. Jesus took things as they were. He had feelings driving Him on which He could not define. He knew He was God's Son, but how or why He did not seem to know. But His relation with God was temporal. He knew of no previous existence. His own teaching and self-consciousness provide no evidence for the doctrine of Incarnation, in and by themselves. He made no claim to an ante-mundane life with God.

But men could not stop there. Wonderful things had happened. The Holy Spirit had come. Miracles were happening. The Church was founded. Sinners were being saved. And all this in the name of Jesus. He could be no ordinary man. No ordinary conception had called Him into life. And the fact that He was alive after His death was clear proof that He was alive before His birth. The Sonship of Jesus was not temporal, but eternal. The paternal and filial relation was essential to the Godhead. I do not say that the movement of thought was exactly like that, but there was movement. But it was not idle speculation. Facts drove the Church along. And behind the facts there was the activity of the Holy Spirit.

Paul sets Jesus by Himself. He is not *primus inter pares*. There is an eternal relation between Jesus and God. But through Jesus we become sons. We can enter the house of the Father, have His companionship and help. Paul calls this adoption through Jesus Christ.

The term *υἱοθεσία* implies the method whereby strangers were adopted into a family or a clan in order to perpetuate the family name. It is closely linked up with the custom of ancestor worship. It was a legal fiction resorted to in order to ensure the continuity of the family worship and the family inheritance. It is fairly common among primitive peoples and was often practised in Greece and Rome. It was not practised, however, among the Jews. Thus the term implies what is more or less a legal fiction. A person is treated at law as a member of a family, although by nature he is not a member of it at all.

Paul takes up this term, as he takes up many other terms, to show the work of God. It is a dangerous term to use. And it has led many astray. Paul uses it in two senses. In Romans, he speaks of the children of Israel as possessing the adoption (9^4). He means God redeemed them from Egypt, made a nation of them, and because of His gracious dealings with them, demanded their allegiance as sons. Their relation was not a natural one: it was a covenant one. They were sons of God by grace, not by right or birth. In this passage in Ephesians, it is individual Christians who are referred to, and what is meant is the nature of those who receive redemption through Christ and are renewed through the gift of the Holy Spirit.

The term can be misinterpreted. It can be made to imply a fictitious and purely accidental relation between men and God, as though God, by His own fiat, made Christians appear to be what in reality they were not. Paul does not imply that in the very least. The *Adopted* is the one who is sanctified through Jesus Christ and the Spirit. By anticipation, he looks upon the sanctification as complete. That is always his method. The Christian is never a Christian. The believer is a saint, but he has to go through a long and painful discipline before he is fully sanctified. Christians are the elect, but they are in a heathen world, and the full moral effects of their redemption have not yet worked themselves out. That is all understandable. But the important point is that the adopted is the regenerated, and the regenerated has regeneration through the grace of God. He has had a new life poured into him. It is not merely that his habits have changed or his conscience wakened up. All these results will accrue to the adopted man. In fact, the saints are urged to work for them. But what makes a son of man into a son of God is something at the back of all these results. He has met God. New life has come from the hills. He is a new man. He has been born of the Spirit, adopted as a son of God through Jesus Christ. Its supernatural character must be stressed. That is why it is called adoption. It is purely an act of grace on the part of God.

Paul would not deny that all men are sons of God. In fact, he tells us that we are. We are made by God. We have a law written in our hearts. We were made in the Divine image. Through long ages, God destined us for sonship to Himself. But He gave us freedom. We could wander. We could sin. We could spoil the image of God. We could desert the Father's house. And then God delivers us. While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.

We are saved to the knowledge of our sonship, and we are permitted to receive the Holy Spirit which will allow us to work out our sonship on ethical lines. The compelling impulse at the back of the prodigal's return home is the urge of the Father's love.

III.

Paul says, further, that we are redeemed 'through his blood' (*i.e.* through the blood of Jesus), and have 'forgiveness of sins.' We have nothing approximating here to a theory of the Atonement. We can easily find in Paul attempts to give a rationale of the atoning grace of God, but there is nothing of that here. And even where we have it, we need to remember three warnings. (1) The first is that Paul is not always consistent with himself. More than one of the classic theories of the Atonement can justify itself from Paul, and each of them can be rebutted with arguments from the same source. We must break for ever with the idea that Paul is an arm-chair theologian, whose one aim is consistency. And we must also break with the idea that he is an inspired theologian, who is giving us Christian theology in terms that are binding for ever. It may be hard to separate his religion from his theology, but the attempt must be made. For the religion of Paul is Christian, pure and undefiled. But in the case of his theology, the chaff must be separated from the wheat. (2) Paul was an apologist, and he met all kinds of opponents. Put briefly, his religion was that in Jesus Christ was the way of redemption from sin and to peace with God, together with sanctification by the Spirit. This is set forth in the two sacraments of baptism and the eucharist. A man's religion must be simple if it is to appeal to simple people, and Paul's did. But his apologetic is often forced and unreal. (3) Paul passed on a good deal he inherited. But it is not necessarily inspired or binding. His view of the material universe is only a curiosity. His angelology need not disturb us. We must distinguish between what belongs to the religion of Jesus and what is drawn from the atmosphere.

There is an ethical seriousness about the New Testament conception of salvation that it is hard to find elsewhere. The entire ancient world was looking for salvation. There were many cults offering to the initiated escape from the ills of the world and absorption into the deity. They all had much the same characteristics. In some quarters in early days, Christianity was set forth as a Mystery religion. There is a certain school of thought at the present time which regards Paul and John as responsible for this. But that is going too far. For them, the sacraments do not operate *ex opere operato*. The effects of both baptism and the eucharist are ethically conditioned. They depend upon the faith of the participant. Further, to the adherents of the Mysteries and to Paul, redemption means two different things. What the initiated mean by it is redemption from the limitations of the world, from Fate, and so on. What Paul means is redemption from sin, and sin takes on a new colouring when it is looked upon as opposition to the Fatherly love of God as it is revealed in Jesus Christ. Further, the death and rising again of the gods is nothing like the death and rising again of Jesus. That of the gods is symbolic and mythical: that of Jesus is historic. In the case of the Mysteries, the effect is upon the emotions and has no bearing upon the character. It is supposed to impart Divine life, but the Divine life is not necessarily ethically conditioned. To Paul, the forgiveness of sins is the very soul of the message of the Cross. The Cross does not act magically. It is operative only as we enter by faith into its meaning. And by receiving the message of the Cross in faith, we enter into a new moral atmosphere, and find ourselves at home with God. All that has nothing at all approximating to it in the Mysteries.

The language of Paul is scarcely intelligible without the Old Testament. To the Jew, the blood is the life, and the shedding of blood refers to the pouring out of life in death, and particularly as the life is poured out sacrificially to God on behalf of men. What Paul means is that the willing offering up of the life of Jesus by Himself in death is the ground of the forgiveness of sins. He attempts here no rationale of the fact. He simply states the fact. He accepts it along with other New Testament writers. He is in line with the thought of the Master, who claimed that He had come to give His life a ransom for many. There is no theology here: it is simply the core of the religion of Jesus. It is easy for interpreters to treat a figure of speech as though it were a theologumenon. We must not do that. We are told that in coming into contact with Jesus Christ, and particularly as we touch Him at the crucial point at Calvary, we touch the redemptive forces of God, which give us forgiveness of sins and ethical renewal. Paul leaves it there. And we can be grateful for the privilege of doing the same.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Creepy, Crawly Things.[1]

'The serpent.'—Gn 3[1].

Are you a dreamy little chap who, when he's walking down the road, isn't really there at all, but far away in some South Sea Island, where the white waves, rolling in from a blue, blue sea, are crashing on the yellow sands; or in the East somewhere, in the golden sunshine, among people all dressed in their bright colours as gaily as our gardens are in June? It must be fine to be out there; and when we tumble out of bed on a raw, shivery morning, it does seem rather horrid to be only here. But there's another side to it. I was reading lately a lady's story of that other side. Yes, she said, it's all very wonderful, but it isn't much fun really to open a packet of flour and find it alive with cockroaches, and just have to pick them out, and use the rest; or to sit down on a chair, and the leg gives, eaten by white ants; or to open the bathroom door, and hear a hissing, and say, 'That stupid boy has left the taps running,' and find it's no tap but a cobra ready to strike. I think the snakes would finish me; to see them, as sometimes happens in the lonelier places, creeping about on the rafters and now and then dropping with a soft thud on the floor. Ah, no! I couldn't stand that; they're so creepy and crawly and slithery and wriggly and horrid. I know lots of them are quite harmless, and that most of them don't want to hurt any one, but just to get away, poor things. But they're not all like that. There's one kind that put their tails tight round a tree, and wait beside a path, and then dart out straight at your eyes! And there's another that comes at you like an arrow. No, I would hate the snakes. I think we're better here. Ah, but we have snakes, too. In this old story, when they want to tell us how horrid evil is—the sulks and passion and meanness we have in our hearts—they say it's like, it's like—it's like a snake, as cruel and cold and dreadful as that. And in your heart and mine there are such horrible things; and however are we to get away from them? For a snake can move as swiftly as a horse, and swim quicker than a fish, and climb faster than a monkey. And there they are, writhing and twisting and hissing, and we in the midst of them. Ah! it's horrid, isn't it?

I know that people from the East always laugh when we talk to them about snakes. Snakes! they say. Oh, we never think of them. In the towns we never see them; and elsewhere—oh, they don't do much harm, really. Nobody worries about them, nobody remembers them, indeed, at all.

Yes; and just because nobody remembers or worries, twenty thousand people in India die every year from snake-bite. They, too, said, 'Snakes! oh, we don't bother about them.' And then one day, just like any other day, all in a moment they got bitten and they died.

We, too, don't bother about these ugly things that dart out of our minds at times; we think it's rather fun to be rough or greedy or selfish, for we get our own way; and in any case, who cares about things like that? They do no harm, we say, not really, and we, too, forget about them. And, then, some day something bites us too. And though we don't see them or remember them, they are always there. I once heard of a man who had a wonderful collection of snakes, and a visitor said, 'But where do you find them? I never see any.' And the other answered, 'I caught forty of them in the room where you are sleeping.' In the day, I suppose, they were in their holes. But think of sleeping there at night, when they come gliding out, and one night find them, all cold in the darkness on one's very bed. And they are in your heart and mine. You mayn't see them; they may be hidden away; but they are there; and when we lose a game, don't you hear them hissing? Or, when we don't get our way and have to come in earlier than we want, ah, then they glide out and lift up their heads and dart and sting, how suddenly and sorely. And if we do get stung, what are we to do? Well, if it's in your finger, you'd better cut it off, and quickly, too, before the poison spreads. Sometimes we can do that; we can leave the thing alone, and be done with it. If it's a nasty book, stop reading it. Cut it off. Be quick, or the poison will spread into your mind. Or if there's a boy who has ugly ways and is soiling yours, leave him alone. Cut off the poisoned bit. Quick! quick!

But sometimes we can't cut it off. The danger lies in some place where we have to go, in something we must do. And what then? Well, long ago, they say, Ireland was full of snakes. But there's none there now. And why? Because St. Patrick chased them all away. He went before, and all these horrid, creepy things came writhing and twisting

[1] By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

and gliding and sliding after him, and away out to the sea, never to come back any more. And Jesus can do that for you and me. You remember how He sent a whole herd of dreadful things rushing into the lake where they were choked; and a good riddance too. If I were you, I would say to Him, 'Here is a little lad, whose heart is full of temper and passion and all kinds of creepy, crawly, loathsome things. Please take them all away, and keep them all away.' And, do you know, He will.

The Persian Woodcarver.[1]

'And the two doors were of fir-tree: . . . And he carved thereon cherubims, and palm trees, and open flowers.'—1 K $6^{34.35}$.

There is a story told of a poor woodcarver, who lived in the city of Teheran, in the heart of Persia. In this beautiful city he would walk abroad to admire the lovely sights around him. There were the many coloured carpets in the bazaar, the gardens also with their red clusters of roses and the caravans crossing the desert like ships at sea. Yet, crowning all in beauty, were the gates of the city temple. Massive in their strength they stood, wrought by cunning artists, with flowers so delicately carved upon them that it seemed as though the wind must blow away the petals. When they opened in the morning it was like angels arising. When they closed at night it was like the seraphim folding their wings. The woodcarver feasted his eyes upon them again and again. His heart longed to possess gates like these. But they were sacred. To copy them was forbidden. The penalty for doing so was death. Then the woodcarver thought of a plan. Every day he went out for a walk, and had a good look at the gates. When he came home, he would remember what he had seen and carve it in wood. This he did each day, always looking at the gates and treasuring up a bit of beauty, till at length, when many months had passed, he had carved a pair of his own. There they stood in his workshop, majestic in their loveliness, a joy to all his friends. But an enemy was jealous of the woodcarver and his treasure. With a heart filled with envy he went and told the priests. They were furious at what had been done. The carver was seized and put to death, and the gates were taken away. For a long time they were lost sight of. Then, just recently, they were discovered in a curio shop in London. They were taken out and set up in the Palace of Beauty in the great Exhibition at Wembley.

[1] By the Reverend J. Kennedy, B.D., Forfar.

That is the story of the woodcarver. What a lover of beauty he was to go and copy those great gates bit by bit! What a splendid time he must have had walking home through the streets of Teheran when the mantle of night was falling, carrying in his mind a little gleam of loveliness to light him on his way! And all the while those beautiful things he had to remember would be making him a better man. Bad thoughts would fade away when he was thinking of the beauty of a rose. A mean action would be hard to do when his mind was treasuring a luscious cluster of grapes. Beautiful thoughts make beautiful deeds, and the carver would grow in beauty day by day.

Would you like to do what he did? Well, here is a way! You have read about Jesus Christ, the finest man who ever lived. Why not try to copy Him? Just come day by day and take a peep at Him. When you have looked at Him steadily, try to be like Him. Remember one day how kind He was, another day how forgiving He was, and still another how unselfish He was, until you have copied Him bit by bit. Of course, it is difficult and it will take a long, long time. But it is worth trying. For gradually, as you work away, a change will steal over you. Your heart will become kinder, your mind more true, and men will see Christ's beauty in your eyes.

The Christian Year.

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Wanted—A Man!

'Run ye to and fro through the streets of Jerusalem, and see now, and know, and seek in the broad places thereof, if ye can find a man, if there be any that executeth judgment, that seeketh the truth; and I will pardon it.'—Jer 5^{1}.

'Wanted!—a man!'—such is this prophet's message to his age. It may remind some of that well-known incident of the Greek philosopher Diogenes searching with a candle at midday in the market-place of Athens. Being asked what he was looking for, he replied, bitterly and abruptly, 'A man.' In a like mood of despairing irony the writer of these words of our text represents Jehovah as bidding him (to quote Moffatt's translation), 'scour the streets of Jerusalem, search the squares, and see if you can find a man of honest mind and of integrity.' God once promised to spare Sodom, if ten righteous men were found in it. Here He declares His willingness to save Jerusalem from destruction, if even one single lover of truth and

justice is discovered within its walls. The saving power of simple men who have the spirit of God in their hearts—that is the lesson we are here taught.

1. 'Wanted, a man!'—it is the world's cry of perplexity and need. And when it says so, it is not necessarily thinking of Mr. Bernard Shaw's 'Superman,' but rather of somebody who knows and sympathizes with our weakness and need, and yet can lead us out of our dark perplexities. Such were the men who fought and fell in the Great War, filling the crowded stage of those tremendous times. They were so very human, with all their faults and shortcomings, and yet so lovable, so patient and brave and unassuming!

The modern quest for individuality is a reaction, a revolt from the one dull pattern into which modern civilization seeks to mould our men and women just as it moulds the houses turned out by identical hundreds, like children's blocks whose unending rows we see in our towns and cities. But Man has no 'standard parts.' We are each unique: and in that uniqueness lies most of our value to society. Man's ever-pressing need is to realize himself.

Thomas Carlyle has expressed this thought in his own forceful way. 'The essence of our being, the mystery in us that calls itself "I" (ah, what words have we for such things?), is a breath from heaven: the Highest Being manifests itself in man. This body, these faculties, this life of ours—is it not all as a vesture for the Unnamed? . . . *We* are the miracle of miracles, the great, inscrutable mystery of God.'

2. But it is not simply *a* man that is wanted—a virile, magnetic personality, however unscrupulous or capricious in the use of his power. A qualification is added, 'that executeth judgment, that seeketh the truth.' To be good is far more important than to be great. God bids Jeremiah seek in the streets of Jerusalem, not for a brilliant statesman or a proud king or a learned scribe, but for one who is faithful to the highest that is in him.

The Church is an institution for patterning men after the likeness of God, for expressing human individuality in terms of the Divine completeness. Goethe says somewhere: 'No greater good can happen to a town, than for several educated men, thinking in the same way about what is good and true, to be living in it.' That is why the members of this Church are called by Christ the salt and light of mankind. But they are not always the great ones in the world's estimation. You remember the New Testament description of Barnabas as 'a good man, full of the Holy Ghost.' The unthinking may hastily vote lives of this type commonplace. But it is sin which is really dull and stupid, and virtue which is interesting and exciting and romantic. The words of the psalmist are profoundly true to the real facts of life. 'Blessed is the man that walketh not in the counsel of the ungodly, nor sitteth in the seat of the scornful' (the superior person!), 'but his delight is in the law of the Lord.'

3. 'Wanted—a man!' As our text reminds us, it is God's need even more than ours. In all reverence let us say that He cannot do without us. For it is through us, imperfect instruments as we often are, that He realizes His purposes for this world of His creation and His love. We must strive to show ourselves worthy of so high an honour and so great a trust. In the fourth chapter of Ephesians, St. Paul expounds his theology of 'the perfect man' or 'the new man.' Unlike some religious teachers, he never disparages humanity, but sets it at the apex of creation, crowned with honour and glory. He constantly exhorts his readers to 'quit them like men,' to 'show themselves men,' to rise to the status and grandeur of true manhood, God's ideal, 'unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.'

Christianity, indeed, has well been described as 'the Divine art of making men.' We are to be all-round men; 'I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved entire'—there is the threefold development, spiritual, intellectual, physical. They are put in the descending order of their importance, but all are essential.

We Christians, then, are pledged to be physically full men, honouring our bodies as the temples of the Holy Ghost, bringing them into subjection, ruling them by temperance, making them fit and strong and beautiful to do God's errands in the world in which we live. And we are to be intellectually full men. 'Reading,' says Bacon,' makes a full man'; and St. Paul bids young Timothy 'give attention to reading, to exhortation, to teaching.' Intellectual pursuits of every kind lift our thoughts out of narrow vocational ruts, and place them in the midstream of the wide circling currents of human mental activity. And supremely are we to aim at becoming spiritually full and well-developed men. Fellowship with God is the heart and essence of all true religion; and we obtain it through the One perfect and complete and representative Man, Christ Jesus.

'Wanted—a man!' That cry is sounding in our ears. God is still scouring the streets to see if He can find a man of honest mind and of integrity.

Christ wants men to-day: men full of strength and vigour and self-sacrifice, to fight in the ranks of those who wage the never-ending crusade against the powers of darkness. Let us trust in Him, lean on Him, go to Him in all our moments of temptation, and we will find His grace sufficient, His goodness supplying our every need, His power and blessing making us whole.[1]

More than half beaten, but fearless,
Facing the storm and the night,
Breathless and reeling, but tearless,
Here in the lull of the fight,
I who bow not but before Thee,
God of the fighting clan,
Lifting my fists I implore Thee,
Give me the heart of a man![2]

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Redeemer and Property.

'When they had brought their boats to land, they eft all.'—Lk 5^{11} (R.V.).

Friendship with Jesus has opened up for Simon and his partners new trade possibilities. Here is one possessed of a secret which enables Him to detect the haunts and habits of fish. All the experience of the craft is superseded by what is equivalent to the discovery of a new method. If Jesus is in the boat, its owners will no longer be dependent upon the weary night-fishing. But no sooner have they succeeded in bringing their nets to land, than one and all abandon the catch upon the beach, and follow Jesus as He leads them away from the familiar strand. Does not such conduct strike us as most extraordinary?

1. Most of us can recall those wonderful stories with which the gorgeous East thrilled our childish imagination in the Arabian Night's Entertainments. Ali Baba becomes possessed of the secret password, 'Open, Sesame!' which admits him to the riches laid up in the recesses of the robbers' secret cave. Or a child of the people is suddenly introduced to the Slaves of the Lamp and of the Ring, who pour into his lap the wealth of Ormuz and of Ind, turning the beggar into a prince and conferring upon him a state beyond the wildest dreams of avarice. How we longed for magic carpets and fairy palaces, and wondered what unimagined jewels the genies of fortune might have in store for ourselves!

That represents the attitude of the world towards those who can show them how to get wealth. 'Depart from me' is the last request which we would willingly address to any one of them. On the contrary, we offer them money, saying, 'Give me also this power.' A new process is discovered. A new industry is opened up. At once there is a rush for shares, and those who are first in the field burn incense to their luck. When riches increase men set their hearts upon them. And there is no prayer which we have more need to pray with bated breath and whispering humbleness than the noble suffrage of our ancient Litany—'In all time of our wealth, good Lord, deliver us.'

2. There is only one explanation of the strange and unexpected result of the miraculous draught of fishes. Peter was somehow made aware that in that sinking boat he stood in the presence of God. Nothing short of this could have filled him with the tremendous sense of his own sinfulness, which became the source and spring of a life of devotion and service. Nothing can so empty a man of the fatal egotism which kills sacrifice as the recognition of sin. And no man ever attains to that hard and humiliating conviction until he has seen God. That is what the golden-mouthed Isaiah has to tell: 'Woe is me—I am a man of unclean lips—I have seen the King.' Job, sitting in dust and ashes, has the same experience. 'I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth thee; wherefore I abhor myself.' And now it is the turn of Simon Peter to cry in the anguish of his heart, 'I am a sinful man.'

In the anguish of his heart! Yes, there is no doubt about the ring of that exceeding bitter cry. But what was there in the circumstances of that successful fishing to suggest an infinite sorrow? We have all heard of the bitter cry of outcast London. We are not so familiar with the burden of Belgravia or the miseries of Mayfair. It is when earthly helpers fail and comforts flee that men are supposed to recognize their need of God, and to be peculiarly alive to the reality of His Presence. But it is the very climax of the miraculous power of God to produce that same overmastering sense of personal unworthiness, when the omens are propitious, and the sun of prosperity begins to shine. And that is the situation which confronts us in this beautiful gospel story.

What wakened the chords of his innermost being, and set them vibrating in response to the Master's touch was the fact that he had been grasped by the hand of the living God and confronted with his Maker and his Judge. And what a blessed experience it was! When such a crisis comes in a

[1] T. B. Stewart Thomson, *The Quest of Youth*, 138.
[2] J. G. Neihardt.

man's life, he passes the Rubicon. The moment becomes eternity, and the vision of an instant the inspiration of a life. Happy are they to whom Christ thus reveals Himself. Happiest of all are they who, when riches have not yet taken to themselves wings, when the hour of death has not yet struck, and men have not yet begun to ask where they shall dig your grave, have been brought down into what Bunyan calls 'that empty and solitary place,' the Valley of Humiliation.

3. 'Hark! said Mr. Greatheart, to what the shepherd's boy saith; so they hearkened, and he said:

> He that is down needs fear no fall:
> He that is low, no pride;
> He that is humble ever shall
> Have God to be his guide.
>
> I am content with what I have,
> Little be it or much;
> And, Lord, contentment still I crave,
> Because thou savest such.
>
> Fullness to such a burden is,
> That go on pilgrimage;
> Here little, and hereafter bliss,
> Is best from age to age.'

That is the spirit of the Christian, and by it all the values of life are changed. The disciple learns to forsake all, not because he has acquired the ascetic habit of monastic discipline, but because he sees life steadily and sees it whole. In the vision of existence we have no longer to allow for the personal equation of incurable egotism. As the man rises from his colloquy with the Redeemer, the voice of reassurance and hope rings in his ears: 'Fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men.'

'Men, not markets!' Wealth can only be interpreted in terms of human lives. The earth is not God's farm, nor the sons of men but His herdsmen and His vine-dressers. It is not the beasts of the forest or the cattle upon a thousand hills that are the object of His intervention in the world's affairs. He has but one aim, one purpose, one end. God's great enterprise is to catch men. All that is meant by property is precisely what has no meaning for God, who for our sake became poor. What a wonderful reading of the problem of the universe is disclosed to the eager hearts of men when the world and all that is therein is seen no longer as property, out of which they may suck no small advantage, and wealth is nothing but unbounded opportunities of service!

This great passion for the lives of men is the leading principle of the social ethics of a Christian. We are freely told that the foundations of civilization are in peril of being cast down, and those who have almost a superstitious reverence for the rights of private property are calling upon the righteous to do something to bear up the pillars of the existing order of society.

There are many questions which we might ask. Is there such a thing as a social order? Does not society, like all else under the sun, move in a perpetual flux? When we speak of the Ten Commandments are we certain that we mean the changeless principles of the Divine Law and not the limitations with which it has been encumbered by the Scribes and Pharisees? How much depends upon the attitude towards a swiftly developing situation of those who, by education and opportunity, though not of right, ought to be the leaders of the people? Will they be the blind critics of democracy? Or will they be content to be less wealthy, less powerful, less secluded, if only they can give more health, greater freedom, larger opportunity to the whole body of the people? We are told that we are heading towards revolution. Our destiny depends on the answer which is returned to these questions.

And for those who, at least, claim Christian discipleship the issue is graver still. The age in which we live has been one of unexampled commercial prosperity and vast accumulation of wealth. The net has indeed been cast upon the right side of the ship. But has the operation brought with it the vision of God? Has there been any disposition on the part of those who own the name of Christ to fall down at Jesus' feet in the spirit of the fisherman of Galilee? If so, then we too have heard that Voice of victorious hope which calls us to share in the redeeming purpose and which bids us fear nothing, for henceforth we shall catch men. The wealth of the world is henceforth valuable only so far as it may be produced, distributed, and used for the salvation of the lives of men.[1]

Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity.

Between Two Worlds.

'Moses was not able to enter into the tent of the congregation, because the cloud abode thereon, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle.'—Ex 40^{35}.

The position in which Moses found himself was one which is common to most living and thinking

[1] J. G. Simpson, *Great Ideas of Religion*, 197.

men and women at some stage or at successive stages in their career. He found himself cut off from the tent of the people, and shut out from the tabernacle of the Lord.

It is at the moment when Moses has completed his inestimable social and spiritual service for his people that we are told of the strange plight which befell his own soul. There is a certain reserve about the statement, as there must always of necessity be about those deep things of the spirit which can never be fully expressed in words; but there is a world of suggestion in them. 'So Moses finished the work,' we are told. '*Then* a cloud covered the tent of the congregation, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle.' He had done the work. Was this to be the reward—denied both human fellowship and Divine worship?

Loneliness is one of the penalties of greatness, whether it takes the form of the rank which raises a man above his fellows, or the demands of scholarship which cut him off from social amusements and intercourse, or the nature of the task which he cannot share with others, or the rigours of saint-hood which erect an impassable barrier. But it seems as if the experience of Moses shadowed forth here was something different from that, something which is shared with him by those of us less richly endowed. Is there any one who has not felt something like disappointment at the finishing of what seemed in the doing of it to be a good and a beneficent piece of work? Instead of that elation of spirit which we promised ourselves as the result of our effort and toil, there settles down a cloud of depression. The result of all our striving seems to have earned neither the gratitude of men nor the blessing of God. At the end of it all we feel disappointed and disillusioned, shut out alike from the easy-going fellowship of others, and, owing to a certain soilure of the spirit contracted through necessary walking in the muddy ways of controversy, farther away than ever from intimate communion with God.

Let us consider two aspects of this experience which are common enough to the majority of us, and then try to discover, if we can, some explanation of it.

1. Many thinking people reach, some time or other, a stage when something like a cloud rests for them on the tent of the congregation. Organized religion seems to be well enough for the generality of mankind; but for them, with their young wits sharpened by contact with the philosophies and sciences of school and college and education generally, the place where others are wont to worship has no attraction. There is a hazy cloud of nebulous unrealities resting on it; and they do not find that it helps to call the dimness God, or its endurance faith. Such cannot enter into the worship of the congregation. Yet neither have they, with all their study, been able to penetrate into that place where the clear white light of absolute truth prevails.

Or, it may be you have done your best, or at any rate not a negligible nothing, for the social and moral welfare of your fellow-men. And your experience of the years of war, or your application to social problems, or your efforts to win the way out to the land of promise, have but resulted in this—that you cannot find the old content and satisfaction in the tent of the congregation. And on the other hand, whilst you have a place for the tabernacle among the ideals of mankind, it seems to have no place for you.

2. But there is another phase of Moses' experience which is perhaps even commoner and more pertinent to the condition of some of us. Moses had done his best for God and man; not, it is true, without errors of judgment and faults of temper, but yet in a noble and self-denying spirit akin to that in which St. Paul and Danton expressed their readiness to be accursed if only blessing might come to their nations. And the result of all his labour and his thought was that he seemed to have fallen between two stools as we say. He had parted with the easy-going content of the majority, without gaining access to the inner shrine where the glory of God was manifest.

And sometimes that sense of frustration overwhelms one who has tried to live the higher life. Once Christ has had His hand on a man He spoils him for lower satisfactions. Such an one has made all through life an honest and earnest attempt to stand for something higher than the things that are seen, and to be a champion of God in the midst of the world's defections; and yet he has sorrowfully to admit that he does not possess that unruffled and inalienable assurance of God for which his soul craves.

Who has been exempt from this sense of failure? Who does not feel it sooner or later—perhaps, like Moses, in the moment when he has finished off some special effort, and pauses for a time and looks round to estimate his real and actual gain? When we think of what life might be, and the poor thing we have made of it; when we recall the splendid visions which once allured us of what might be accomplished by earnest effort, and then consider the meagre result and dissatisfied state in which

we now find ourselves, we feel as if there were no guiding hand or God in life, no logical outcome of things. If life had been lived selfishly, with no other thought than that of personal satisfaction and material gain, we think that we would not have wondered at the plight in which we find ourselves. But so often it is those who have lived for others and sought to mould their life to high ends who feel shut out from both tent and tabernacle. They have espoused some cause, of the excellence of which they were thoroughly convinced, but its chariot-wheels drag heavily or roll backwards. They have set their hearts on reclaiming or helping some fellow-creature, and, notwithstanding all their self-denying efforts, they have a sickening sense of defeat. Their sacrifice of time and means seems often to have been misapplied, and their kindness shamefully abused. It was not for gratitude that Moses worked, much less for reward, but his confidence for the moment in human nature and even in Divine truth must have been shaken. He must have felt that there was little use in serving either God or man, when he could enter neither tabernacle nor tent.

Is there any explanation of this seeming failure? Well, the higher a man's idea of what the world should be, the more likely is he to be depressed at times by the appearance of things around him, and by the painfully slow rate of progress which the cause of righteousness and truth seems to make. All who have tried to do any kind of good work must have had this experience, especially if they set out with high enthusiasm and great hopes. They cannot go back to the old content and indifference, let their hands hang down, and say, 'Well, what does it matter, anyway?' And they have not yet seen the glory of God or felt His presence in the degree for which they had hoped.

Moses may have been qualified to do the work he did, and to be the inspiration to the world he has been, just because of the plight in which he found his own soul. He could not stay in the tent and he could not settle down in the tabernacle, just because he was fully conscious of both. He was neither so dazzled by the glory that he was insensible of the gloom, nor so wrapt in the fog that he saw nothing of the sun. He was a mediator. When men looked on him they saw something of the eternal light irradiating him; when God looked on him he was backgrounded by the grey cloud of human sorrow and sin. Consider how clouds are formed. They are due to the action of sun *and* moisture, not the one alone, and never the other alone. And the mist and the mystery that enwrap us in the spiritual atmosphere are likewise due to a double cause—not the tears of earth alone, but the play and interaction upon those of the drawing power of 'something afar from the sphere of our sorrow.'

And may it not be that our very despondency arises from our looking too much to success and too little to duty? 'We are poor soldiers,' said Dr. John Ker, 'if we make our fealty to our banner depend so much upon its glittering in the sunshine of victory. God must have standard-bearers who are ready to make a shroud of their colours, and how can they be known but in hours of defeat?' Have you ever noticed the suggestive distinction that we make in two common and similar phrases, when we speak of 'the eyes of the world,' but, on the other hand, of 'the sight of God'? Eyes do not always see; and what has been overlooked by the eyes of the world may be precious in the sight of God. Consider the plight of soul of a greater than Moses. In that same hour when He said of His redeeming work, 'It is finished,' the dark cloud came down upon Him and He tasted the full bitterness of the awful loneliness which feels itself shut out at once from tent and tabernacle, unable alike to penetrate the gloom or to behold the glory. But it was not a permanent plight. It behoved Him to be made like unto His brethren. But out of the battle, in the act and article of death, Jesus proclaimed aloud His victory, 'Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit.' Mankind was saved to God. The glory of the Father was at length unveiled: the cloud had lifted for evermore.[1]

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Hallowed be Thy Name!

'Hallowed be thy name.'—Mt 6[9].

The Lord's Prayer consists of two parts, the first concerning the rights of God, the second concerning the needs of men. And in this order. This is, in truth, the proper order of things. The Son of God, speaking to sons of God, could only teach us to pray 'after this manner,' in this order of petition. 'Seek ye first,' said Jesus, 'the kingdom of God and his righteousness,' everything else is a mere appendage to that. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart and strength,' that is, 'the first and great commandment; the second is like unto it.' You are a son, and you have a father

[1] H. L. Simpson, *Put Forth by the Moon*, 39.

whom you revere and love. Let any man rob or insult your father, or meddle with his good name, and you are all aflame; you can hardly keep your hands off that man! So we can understand, in our little, passionate, human way, something of what Jesus felt in His grand, Divine, and perfect way about the honour and good name and just rights of the heavenly Father in this world of ours; you can understand something of the feelings in the breast of Jesus which lay behind the first three petitions of the Lord's Prayer. 'Father, hallowed be thy name; thy kingdom come; thy will be done': it is a supplication that God may have the loving reverence, the loyal obedience which are His due from the children of men, and that are so dear to Him.

Now the second part of the Lord's Prayer is built upon the first. Let God have His rights; He will see to it that men have their needs met. Let the children honour and obey their Father; He will take care to cherish and protect them. A true worship is the best guarantee for a just social order; the Brotherhood of men rests upon the Fatherhood of God. Let the spirit of man be set right, right at the centre and spring, in those deep roots and fibres by which, half unconsciously to ourselves, the soul reaches out to the unseen, right in its fundamental relations to God, and other things, sooner or later, will right themselves.

Understanding therefore the supreme importance, the rightful primacy, of this first prayer that Jesus puts into our lips, let us ask ourselves two questions about it: first, what do we suppose it to mean? secondly, how do we expect it to be fulfilled?

1. In the first place, *what then do we really mean*, what do we wish God to do, when we ask Him to see to it that His name is hallowed by all men?

It is well that we should check ourselves sometimes when these sacred and familiar words pass our lips, lest we be found using 'vain repetitions as the heathen do,' the very thing against which our Lord warned us in dictating the prayer.

What do we mean, what should we mean, when we breathe out to the great listening Father the entreaty, 'Hallowed be thy name'? What is it that in our minds we wish and ask for? The bare etymological sense of the word is doubtless familiar: to 'hallow' is to 'make holy,' to 'consecrate' or 'sanctify.' But then, one thinks God's name *is* holy; His name is the expression of His being, and that is holiness itself. We add nothing to, we can detract nothing from, His pure and eternal perfection. The great God is infinitely above our disrespect, our petty insolence. Yes, so He is in His own absolute being. But see how He has humbled Himself, how He has bowed His heavens and come down. By the very fact of revelation, most of all by the Incarnation, the Eternal has put Himself within our reach. Just because God has come so near to us, we have the power to commit outrage upon His name. And many do. There is no profanity like Christian profanity. There are those to whom the holy names of God and Christ serve no other purpose than that of a vile expletive.

There are others, in His sight it may be more guilty, for profanity is often ignorant and unthinking, who pay to His name the conventional tribute, the mock reverence of the bended knee and the feigned lips, with hearts cold to His love and persistently disobedient to His known will. Now we pray that all this may cease—profanity, hypocrisy, unbelief,—that men may think of God and speak of God, and speak to God, everywhere with filial love and awe.

We can in some degree enter into our Lord's thoughts and purpose when He taught His disciples thus to pray. The thing that distressed and hurt Him most, that He saw to be at the bottom of the misery and mischief of the world, was human ignorance of God. 'O righteous Father,' He cried in sorrow, 'the world hath not known thee.' He turned round sharply once on the Jews, His own people, to whom God had revealed Himself above all others, and He said to them terrible words: 'You say that he is your God, and you have not known him!' So it was within the pale of Israel, while beyond its borders were the great masses of the heathen, of whom He was often thinking—He refers to them in the context of this prayer—possessed, as He knew, by all sorts of base and shameful ideas of the Divine nature. This ignorance of God, this estrangement from God, was the unspeakable grief of the heart of Jesus. His mission was to remove it, to 'shew us the Father,' and restore us to the Father's love. He unites us with Himself in this mission when He puts this prayer within our lips.

2. There were two things most adverse to the petition in the mind of our Lord, two things that He meant His disciples to pray against in using it: these were Jewish unbelief and heathen idolatry; and the two chief obstacles are to-day, *Christian unbelief* and *Heathen idolatry*. These are the things that meet the eyes of our Heavenly Father, as He looks down on the earth seeking His true worshippers.

Let us think of the latter of these two contra-

dictions to our Lord's Prayer. Most of us take some interest in missions to the heathen and make some effort for their maintenance. But I am not sure that our zeal springs always from the deepest motives, from the spirit that breathed in the Lord's Prayer. There is a sentimental and romantic interest in foreign missions, fed by thrilling narratives and lively descriptions of strange lands and peoples. There is a philanthropic interest, awakened by pity for the misery and degradation of our fellow-men, a longing to convey to the pagan world the blessings of Christian enlightenment and freedom: such motives cannot be too strong and active in our lives. But this is not the deepest motive.

As I stood in Benares, at the centre of Hinduism, where, I suppose, idol-worship is concentrated as nowhere else in the world, the horror and shame of it all came upon me; the sense of the infamy, the disgrace and ruin brought upon humanity by the perversion of the religious instincts, was brought home to me in a way that I can but feebly convey. We know how the Old Testament saints felt about idolatry, the grief and indignation with which the scenes of heathen worship filled them, as they saw the Most High dishonoured, dishallowed in His own world by the setting up of heathen altars. Now, we know much more of God than they; we have a far more tender and intimate revelation of the Divine character than was conveyed to them; and we know, or at least we may know if we care about the matter, more than they did about the extent and the effects of heathenism amongst mankind: our distress and indignation should be correspondingly more intense and more passionate than theirs. But how cold and unconcerned our hearts often are in regard to the glory of God and the hallowing of His name! Yet we are His sons and daughters, and call Him daily 'Our Father'!

The time will come for this apathy to be shaken off. The time must come when we shall no longer play at foreign missions, but the Church will be ready to pour out blood and treasure for the winning of God's Kingdom, and to send out her sons by whole regiments, as a great nation does when empire and honour are at stake.

'Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come.' We are asking, when we thus pray, that all profanity, that all unbelief, that all idolatry shall cease amongst men, that mankind shall everywhere bear themselves towards God with filial reverence and awe.[1]

[1] G. G. Findlay, *God's Message*, 71.

Twenty-first Sunday after Trinity.

Faith and Character.

'This is a faithful saying, and these things I will that thou affirm constantly, that they which have believed in God might be careful to maintain good works. These things are good and profitable unto men.'—Tit 3^{8}.

The Apostle has been rehearsing the great evangelical facts, and he adds what, in experience, he had found true, that right conduct follows upon Christian teaching when that is seriously given. This is by no means a universal impression, and it may be useful to examine it for ourselves.

As soon as the assertion is made, a region of exception suggests itself which extends so far as to seem to cover most of the facts. Mr. Disraeli, in one place, says: 'A man's conduct depends on his temperament, and not on a bundle of fusty maxims.' We cannot but see that a man's conduct depends on his upbringing and his temperament, at least as much as on his opinions. Honest and clean-hearted people are found in all the churches and outside of them all, so that we cannot help questioning if belief and character have any close connexion with each other. A good man is not good because of some reason he can set down on paper, certainly not in order to win heaven or to escape hell; if that were his only reason he would not be good. When Burns says:

> The fear o' hell's a hangman's whip
> To haud the wretch in order,

he is using words carefully as he always did, for it is only 'the wretch,' the poorest kind of creature, who can be frightened into a show of virtue. A man who is honest because that is the best policy is a very indifferently honest man; and his neighbour is incalculably more worthy of respect whose integrity is due not to calculation, nor even because it will please God, but because of a positive bent in his nature.

What is the use then, of saying, as Paul does, that by laying stress on a particular type of doctrine you will lead men to be careful about their honesty? The region of exception extends so far as to seem to cover all the facts, but it does not cover quite them all.

1. For there is a prior question of the *creating of character*, of how these better impulses first came to be formed. Suppose there is no instinct of goodness to start from, are we to conclude that 'he that is filthy must be filthy still' (Rev 22^{11}), bound to travel to the end on whatever road he blundered

into at the first? That would be for many a doctrine of despair; but in the kindness of God, there are forces visibly at work which arrest and uplift and transform, so that men who began with every disadvantage have passed beyond their more fortunate neighbours, and are found at the last with the heroes and the saints. For with Christ 'there is strength to create goodness in the worst and to make the weakest strong.'

Paul could speak with knowledge of such forces, for his task was everywhere to create the very beginnings of character. His audiences were composed largely of slaves and labourers of the rougher class, in whom no purity or elevation of habit could be taken for granted. He cautions his readers not to use foul language and not to steal; in a bad case of immorality he was hampered by the fact that the offender was not conscious of doing wrong.

To our shame, it has to be confessed that in every city there are districts in which this work is also waiting to be done. Human nature has touches of an almost ineradicable nobility, and the long ministry of Christian education and example has not gone for nothing, so that ideals of kindness, and loyalty, and chastity are discovered in the most unlikely quarters. But brutalizing influences are at work: boys and girls are growing up without a chance, since all the holy things—love, obedience, reverence, piety—have been polluted for them from the outset.

If this be true, if consciences have to be made quick, and new instincts and habits created, how is the work to be attempted without a gospel?

Paul was never afraid of direct moral instruction, but he also knew that instruction by itself is vain. If you are to persuade a man to make an effort, you may first need to change his atmosphere, and create in him some kind of self-respect. You find him, to all appearance, a coarse creature, with his nature possessed by the clamour of the senses—impatient, hungry, unclean. He scarcely thinks, and the only delights he knows are base. What is the use of telling him not to utter foul language, unless you give him something else to talk of? He speaks, as you and I do, 'out of the abundance of his heart,' so your first task must be to give him a new sort of abundance, a better furnished inner world.

George Whitefield tells of the brutalized colliers at Kingswood, who crowded to listen to him as they came out of the pits. 'The first evidence of their being affected was to see the white gutters made by their tears, which plentifully fell down their black cheeks. Having no righteousness of their own to renounce, they were glad to hear of a Jesus who was a friend to publicans, and who came to call not the righteous but sinners to repentance.' Into their sordid existence, without dignity and without self-restraint, without thought or books or prayer, there entered this ever wonderful message of the coming of Jesus Christ, and the whole world was transformed by that.

In the verses which immediately precede the text Paul has spoken of the bankruptcy of human nature: 'We ourselves were once senseless, disobedient, astray, enslaved to all manner of passions and pleasures; we spent our days in malice and envy, we were hateful and we hated one another.' The evidence of a catastrophe of misdirection and revolt stared him in the face; but as he believed in God he was sure that this catastrophe was within the sphere of God's working, and he was prepared, above the loss and tragedy, to see a purpose of Divine restoration. Thus rejoicingly he proclaims (v.[4]) that 'the kindness and *philanthropy* of God appeared.' That unexpected word occurs only once besides in the New Testament, where Luke records of the rude folk at Malta that they 'shewed us no common philanthropy.'

Even in people outwardly correct, real wonders of renewal are accomplished. Paul himself was not ashamed to protest that before he met with Christ he had 'lived in all good conscience'; and yet, when God's mercy was disclosed to him, he felt as if he were looking out on another world. His own account of it is, 'God, who at the first bade light to shine out of darkness, has shined in my heart,' as if a fresh creation were beginning.

2. But the gospel serves not merely for the creating, but for the *refreshing and enriching of character*. Even if, without reserve, it could be granted that 'conduct depends upon temperament, and not on a bundle of fusty maxims,' the fact remains that temperament itself is not a fixed quantity. Certain possibilities of character may become prominent whilst others are overshadowed. Hosea confesses of his nation that 'grey hairs are here and there upon him, and he knoweth it not,' for unconsciously men become more selfish and timorous and narrow. Beliefs which used to move them pass to what Coleridge calls 'the dormitory of the soul,' where they are not extinct, but only sleeping; and some force is needed to make men feel with vividness and reality the glory of these half-forgotten things.

'Ye were redeemed,' says Peter, 'from your heartless way of living, not with corruptible things, but with the precious blood of Christ'; so if, at any time, the meaner fashions are coming back

upon us, and we grow selfish and worldly, and live without rebuke on the surface of life, Peter would have us look at the cost of our redemption.

What do you imagine would happen if all of us realized as in a flash the greatness of God's estimate of our life, and in the way in which it was redeemed by a life laid down? What self-searching and dismay there would be, what sorrow for the time that is gone, and what resolving for the days which remain! No one of us would take up existence to-morrow where he left it yesterday, and it would be his moral standards and activities which would bear the trace of that rediscovery of a doctrine.[1]

[1] W. M. Macgregor, *Repentance unto Life*, 211.

The Mustard 'Tree.'

By the Reverend Albert J. Matthews, Grimsby.

'Unto what is the kingdom of God like? It is like a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and cast into his own garden; and it grew, and became a tree; and the birds of the heaven lodged in the branches thereof.'—Lk 13[18. 19].

The expositors of the New Testament have always found a difficulty in this Parable—the difficulty of finding a mustard tree big enough to meet its requirements. It is a mustard plant that must be big enough to merit the term 'tree,' and it must be a tree big enough for the birds of heaven to lodge in the branches of it. No such mustard 'tree' is known. Thomson, in *The Land and the Book*, struggles to identify it, without carrying conviction to the critical reader, and in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, the article 'Mustard,' by Dr. Post, while it is fairly satisfactory in respect of St. Matthew's phraseology, fails to explain what the writer terms 'the more exaggerated language of Luke.' Finally, Professor A. B. Bruce says: 'The plant at its best is only a great herb, and it can be called a tree only by a latitude in the use of words.' The question therefore emerges, was Jesus speaking of a real tree? Does the Parable demand a real tree? Is not the point of it, the abnormal nature of the growth as compared with the smallness of the seed? *A mustard seed becomes a tree*; that is the arresting thing. Jesus was always saying arresting things. For instance, He said, 'It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.' There have been many attempts to enlarge the eye of that needle or to reduce the size of the camel, but without much success. The words still stand as an example of the startling thought of Jesus, and the saying is considered by many to be a hard saying. Jesus also said, 'If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his father and mother, and wife and children. . . . Yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.' Such words are calculated to shock the dullest mind into activity. They are arresting words. And here for the purpose of His teaching, Jesus assumes an arresting event—a mustard seed endued with more than ordinary potencies, which in its amazing growth transcends the limitations of its own order and becomes 'a tree.' This particular grain which Jesus imagines for the sake of His argument, when it reaches the fully developed plant stage, does not stay there like other mustard plants, but bursts through the bounds assigned it, and continues further to grow until it becomes 'a *tree*' big enough, and strong enough, for the birds of the air to lodge in its branches.

In reality Jesus is not talking of mustard seeds and trees at all, but of the Kingdom of God, and there are no exact analogies on earth to that Kingdom. Jesus had to enhance the facts of His illustrations and analogies, which have to do with things earthly, to show the transcendent realities of the Spiritual Realm He had come to unfold. His mustard seed must become a tree in order to show the miraculous potencies of His Kingdom. His hearers must be made to see that the vitalities of the Kingdom of God make a man greater—greater than society can make him, greater than politics can make him, greater than education can make him. The new potencies of the Kingdom break down accepted boundaries, scatter accepted categories, transcend accepted limitations, and give birth to things bigger, better, and more wonderful.

We are contented if our mustard seed becomes a plant, the mustard seed of Jesus must become a tree. In other words, everything must be bigger and better for His coming. Everything in His Kingdom must show the miracle of His transcendent

Saviourhood. The man with the powers of the Kingdom in him is a man who will transcend himself. Barrier after barrier will give way before the pressure of the new life, power will be added to power, acquirement to acquirement, grace to grace, until he shall become a tree of the Lord, full of sap, throwing out great branches, for the help and comfort, shelter and salvation, of baffled and distraught and impoverished earth pilgrims. Nietzsche has made us familiar with the idea of the Super Man. 'I teach you the Super Man. Man is something to be surpassed,' he says. Jesus in this Parable teaches us the 'Super Man.' The vital grain of the Kingdom becomes 'a tree.' The man of the Kingdom transcends his own order and becomes a 'Super Man.'

1. He passes the normal human limit in his command of moral strength and in the wealth of his moral resources. In his *Psychology of the Christian Soul*, Stevens says: 'Christianity potent in the lives of common people, when it comes to them in its power, gives them a love of personal uprightness, of purity and all worthy living; it enables them in a new way to help their fellows; it delivers them, as it were in an instant, from the thraldom of some vice, changing greed into generosity, violent temper into gentleness, pride into lowliness of mind, contempt of those he counts his inferiors into love of them, and a debased imagination into strenuous effort to protect the innocent.' He finds a well of moral strength springing up within him. He can face what other men similarly constituted cannot face. He can overcome what other men of a like nature find invincible. He can

> Conquer love of self and lusty life,
> Tear deep-rooted passions from the breast,
> Still the inward strife.

It is the opinion of 'Alpha of the Plough' that 'You can never be sure of a man's moral nature until you have shipped him—

> Somewhere East of Suez
> Where the best is like the worst,
> Where there ain't no ten commandments
> And a man can raise a thirst . . .—

until, in fact, you have got him away from his defences, and left him in uncontrolled governance of himself.'

Let me tell of one who, abroad in one of earth's moral cesspools, where restraints of civilization are cast aside, and hell opens wide her portals on every side, lives a white life, a life of moral splendour, and who when asked how he did it, replied, 'I can do all things through Christ who strengtheneth me, for the life that I now live, I live by faith in the Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me.' There, in that dark place, he demonstrates that he has a power within that passes human limits, and he is there a Super Man. The grain of mustard seed has become 'a tree.' Nietzsche asks, 'What have you done to surpass man?' The question that can be answered is, 'What has Christ done?' Livingstone was first of all a Christian. In the speech that he made when the University of Glasgow conferred upon him an honorary degree, he propounded the question, 'Shall I tell you what sustained me in my exiled life among strangers whose language I could not understand? It was this that comforted me, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world."' We can scarcely think of Livingstone without thinking of Stanley—and Stanley would probably be one of Nietzsche's Super Men, having all the qualities of stern and strong leadership, and ruthless prosecution of ends. Stanley did not find Faith until he found Livingstone, and this is what he said about him: 'For four months and four days I lived with him in the same house, or in the same tent, or in the same boat, and I never found a fault in him. . . . Each day's life with him added to my admiration for him. His gentleness never forsakes him, his hopefulness never deserts him. His is the Spartan heroism, the inflexibility of the Roman, the enduring resolution of the Anglo-Saxon. The man has conquered me.' Nietzsche's Super Man is overcome by Christ's Super Man. The Conqueror is conquered. The mustard plant has become 'a tree.'

2. The man possessed of the vitalities of the Kingdom passes the ordinary human boundaries in his self-sacrifice. What gives self-sacrifice its quality is the motive that prompts it. In any given act of self-sacrifice the motive is the most difficult thing to get at. Some years ago, during a great fire in London, some children were in jeopardy in one of the upper stories. A man was seen to rush into the flaming building. The crowd cheered and cheered, and waited breathlessly for his return. In a few minutes, which seemed like hours, he emerged from the flames carrying—a tin box. The crowd roared in terrible wrath, and the man had to be protected by the police. Had that man been burned to death, he would have been hailed a hero, and accorded a public funeral. What looked like a noble act of self-immolation proved an act of callous self-interest. In George Bernard Shaw's great play, *Joan of Arc*, Joan's work is

set forth as an act of sublime and beautiful self-sacrifice, but nobody will see it, nobody *can* see it, and the utter pathos of it all melts the heart, and Joan's work is religious work, inspired by God and the saints.

The sacrifice of Jesus is great, not because of the physical sufferings, but because it was so entirely of love. He was equal with God, and therefore what He did must be entirely for others' good. The seed of the Kingdom is His life, and when that possesses a man he breaks all the accepted selfish categories. He rises above unregenerate human nature. He becomes a redeemer, to die if need be in the service of his fellows, for their good and not his own, at the command of Him who is regnant in his soul. In Parkman's *Conspiracy of Pontiac*, the story of the Jesuit Mission in Canada is very briefly told, but what a story it is! 'Inspired with a self-devoting zeal to snatch souls from perdition, and win new empires to the Cross; casting from them every hope of earthly pleasure or earthly aggrandisement, the Jesuit fathers buried themselves in deserts, facing death with the courage of heroes, and enduring torments with the constancy of martyrs. Their story is replete with marvels—miracles of patient suffering and daring enterprise.' Their path 'was a thorny and a bloody one; and a life of weary apostleship was often crowned with a frightful martyrdom.' Jean de Brebeuf and Gabriel Lallemant suffered excruciating agonies in deaths of ingenious torment. 'Isaac Jogues taken captive by the Iroquois was led from canton to canton, and village to village, enduring fresh torments and indignities at every stage of his progress. Men, women, and children vied with each other in ingenious malignity. Redeemed at length by the humane exertions of a Dutch Officer, he repaired to France, where his disfigured person and mutilated hands told the story of his sufferings. But the promptings of a sleepless conscience urged him to return and complete the work he had begun, to illumine the moral darkness upon which he fondly hoped he had thrown some rays of light. "So he returned, and a blow of a tomahawk closed his mission and his life."'

What made them do it? The urge of the life of Christ within their souls. Such stories can be paralleled by the records of all Missionary Societies, and also in the quieter ways of the common lives of men. The 'powers of the world to come' in the soul of man burst all bonds of self-interest, and man surpasses himself. The mustard seed becomes 'a tree.'

3. Finally, the son of the Kingdom transcends all human limitations in his grip of God, and his consciousness of the unseen spiritual world. Find the greatest saint in the non-Christian world, and the least in the Kingdom is greater than he. 'Man is constituted,' says Du Bose in his *St. Paul*, 'by his nature . . . not Son of God . . . but *to become* Son of God. That is, it is his nature to enter, beyond his nature, and outside of himself, into an objective, transcendental, personal, or spiritual relationship with God, of which will be born his Sonship. All of Son that there is in *Him* consists in his capacity to become *Son*.'

The man sure of God and in conscious relation with Him is 'beyond his nature.' The son of the Kingdom gets past himself when he really grips God. 'O the bliss,' says J. G. Paton, as musket and spear are levelled at his life, 'O the bliss of knowing and seeing Him who is invisible.' There are many who have little of the learning of the schools, but they know God, and know the bliss of knowing Him, and that is the characteristic of the son of the Kingdom. He is more than man in his spiritual grasp. He is 'beyond his nature.' He is Super Man.

The great mass of men are not sure of God. They know little or nothing of Him. Human nature *per se* knows not God. The Christ man knows Him, for Christ has given to him 'the power to *become* son of God.' To him 'old things' have '*become* new,' and finally, 'The kingdoms of this world are (to) *become* the kingdom of our Lord and his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever.' For the Kingdom of God is like 'a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and cast' into the area of his own life, 'and it grew . . . and grew . . . and grew—and became . . . a tree.'

An Address to Divinity Students.

By the Reverend William Ross, B.D., Edinburgh.

I have not chosen a subject; my subject has chosen me, and that subject is your Kingdom, the only Kingdom over which you can ever reign as absolute monarch, namely, your own life.

'Not what I have,' wrote Carlyle, 'nor what I do, but what I am, that is my Kingdom.' Writing to a young man on the eve of his ordination, Keble said, 'Your first duty will be to keep yourself in order.'

You will yet preach many sermons, great sermons, we hope; but one sermon you will preach every day, whether conscious of it or not, the weightiest, the most effective, the most fruitful, we trust, of all your sermons, the sermon of your life. 'One man,' said Charles Kingsley, speaking of the members of the Church—but the words hold good still more of its ministers—'One man who does not change his religion with his Sunday clothes, but carries the thought of God with him, till it permeates every duty and detail of his life, that man is worth a thousand sermons; he's a living Gospel.'

Now in speaking of the perfect life, in the New Testament sense of perfection, the conviction grows upon me that such perfection as we can reach consists very largely in the balance of seeming opposites; not simply in the 'Golden Mean' of Aristotle, a criterion of ethics doubtful in itself and difficult of application, but in various principles or attributes which may be developed to the full, but which must be kept in balance with each other.

There is, for example, the balance of height and depth—the balance of emotion, vision, imagination, aspiration (for these things are character in its height), and depth of conviction; a conscience about what we believe, that is not satisfied till it has probed every article of faith to the bottom. There is the balance of length and breadth, the long narrow plank of duty which must be trodden every day and all the days, and the breadth of a large sympathy and charity. The Holy City, the New Jerusalem, is like the perfect life in this, that the height and length and the breadth of it are equal.

There is the balance of self-sacrifice and of self-assertion. The symbol of our life is the Cross; the principle of our life, the law of it, is self-sacrifice. 'If any man come after me, let him take up his cross, and follow me.' Obedience to the call of sacrifice has no limit, not even life itself. But there were occasions in the life of our Lord, like that of the cleansing of the Temple, or the message He sent to Herod, or the vials of holy indignation which He poured out on the hypocrisy and unreality of Scribe and Pharisee, when the law of His life was not self-sacrifice but self-assertion, the assertion of righteousness, of reality, of God.

There is the balance of reticence and of expression. There is a time to speak, and there is a time to be silent. That balance will be determined very much by the audiences you address. There will be close intimate occasions, Bible Classes, Young Communicants, Prayer Meetings, when, very freely and frankly, you can open the volume of your own experience and give much help in doing so; but there will be other audiences, promiscuous gatherings, before which it would be well to exercise more reticence. In all these things you will be guided by the Spirit of wisdom and grace. Ask, and it shall be given you.

But for a few moments I would speak particularly of the balance of the breadth and the narrowness of the Christian life. 'Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, that leadeth unto life.' Is, then, the Christian life a narrow one? If so, in what sense is it narrow?

That there are some aspects of the Christian life in which it is not narrow, but broad without limit, is evident. Narrowness in these things would be no gospel; it would be a kind of life we could not accept, still less proclaim. The Christian life is not narrow in its outlook, or in its interests. It is not narrow in its culture. It is broad as the universe of matter and of mind. This world is God's world, and it is ours. That God should have brought a world of wonder and beauty like this into being and should not think of and care for every part of it, the least as well as the greatest, is not conceivable. The wider and the deeper your knowledge of existing things, the more fully you enter into fellowship with God in His thought. That the Christian life has not been narrow in its culture can be demonstrated from history; for every great name in science, philosophy, art, in any department of culture, for every great savant who has been agnostic or unbelieving, the Christian Church can produce a greater still who has believed in and worshipped Jesus Christ. Names need not be given; they occur to every one. With complete confidence we can say that the biggest men in knowledge who can be named,

have been humble, believing disciples of Jesus Christ.

The Christian life is not narrow in its humanity. It is breadth without limit. Nothing human is alien to us. That also is demonstrable. The verdict of history is with us. Who are the great benefactors of the race, its great philanthropists, its pioneers in altruistic service, its liberators, its reformers? Without exception these have been followers of Jesus Christ. It is not narrow in its charity. God is Love, pure, universal, unchanging beneficence. To live in love is to live in God.

Do we not glory in the truth that no man ever lived whose human nature was broader, deeper, loftier than Jesus Christ's?

And yet it was Christ Himself who said 'Strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, that leadeth unto life.' What did He mean? In what respect is the Christian life narrow? In one respect only. It is narrow, exclusive, intolerant of wrong-doing. It is narrow as a razor's edge on sin. Its definition of sin, moreover, cuts very deep. Sin is not only a thing of deed, but also of desire. Whosoever looketh and lusteth hath already committed sin in his heart. Being intolerant of sin, the Christian life is equally intolerant of everything that produces sin. It is not narrow on the question of company. You may mingle freely with all kinds of people. Our Lord dined with the Pharisees; He sat at meat also, and oftener with the publican and the social outcast.

It is not narrow on the question of recreation. No recreation that is innocent in itself is forbidden to the disciple of Christ. The Christian ideal does not lay down rules for life; it enunciates great principles. Some of these go very deep and very far. One of them is this, 'Whatsoever is not of faith.' If there be any action or recreation about which you have doubt whether it is right or wrong, any action for which you have not the clear approval of conscience and of Jesus Christ, 'that is sin.' Another principle is this, 'All things are lawful to me, but all things are not expedient.' We must think of others as much as, if not more than, ourselves. There are two circles in which the disciple of Christ may choose to live. One is the circle of liberty, very large in its circumference; the other is much narrower, the circle of love, that circle of which the Apostle made choice when he said, 'If meat cause my brother to offend,'—and it must be remembered that he does not speak there of some form of sin, but the stumbling-block of the scruple of a hypersensitive conscience—'if meat cause my brother to offend, I will eat no flesh while the world standeth, lest I make my brother to offend.' In other words, the Christian life is narrow, absolutely intolerant upon selfishness and sin.

You know your *Pilgrim's Progress*—I hope you do. You remember that when the Pilgrim passed through the Wicket Gate he entered Interpreter's house. The first room in it was private and darkened. It was the hidden life of Interpreter himself. In that room there was a picture which could be seen only by the light of a candle. It was the Ideal Interpreter. Let me remind you of its features. The countenance was very grave, not the gravity of sadness; the note of the Christian life is joy; but the gravity of seriousness—life and its task taken seriously—the seriousness of one who wages a great battle not for his own life alone but for the lives of others—the tense seriousness of an athlete who toes the line and means to run so as to win. His eyes looked upward, heavenward. Your eyes must often be bent downwards on your books, on your daily work. But the attitude of the spirit every day may be upward, heavenward. That attitude is greatly helped by the first moments of the morning. 'In the morning, O Lord, will I direct my prayer unto thee, and look up.'

'The best of books was in his hand.' Bunyan has been often described as the man of one book. That is not accurate. He had a library of thirty to forty volumes. But supreme among these was his Bible, which, as Froude says, 'he knew from cover to cover.'

'The law of truth was on his lips'—veracity always, reality always. God's truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

'The world was behind his back,' not the world of Nature, or of human nature, but the world as John saw it crystallized, symbolized in the Roman Empire, 'the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, the pride of life.'

'There was a golden crown over his head'—the Crown of life, life here crowned with the fullness of life hereafter, the crown of righteousness that fadeth not away.

'And he stood as if pleading with men,' not driving, but leading, pleading.

Here is the ideal. Cherish it. The flag of the ideal must always fly at the top of the mast; a flag half-mast is a symbol of death. Ideals are the evidence of a living soul. Cherish them, never lower them; make no compromise with them; live close to the Great Ideal, our Master and Lord.

All which counsel may be summed up in the word which Paul spoke to Timothy, 'Take heed to thyself (ἔπεχε, 'take hold of thyself'), and of the doctrine; continue in them, for in so doing thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee.'

Recent Foreign Theology.

Autobiographical Theology.

THE strenuous and courageous efforts of Germany to recover its place among the nations in all spheres of human activity must command our respect. Severe as was the loss to German learning and culture, which the economic conditions of the country after the war inflicted, in this realm also a spirit of dauntless enterprise is being manifested. An instance of this is the undertaking of a series of volumes[1] to set forth the learning of the present in philosophy, economics, medicine, law, history, pedagogy, and theology. The plan of the work is original. Scholars and thinkers have been invited to give an account of their own life and work, indicating their own intentions in what they have said or done. The danger of such 'autobiographical theology' would appear to be egotism; but this has been avoided by most of the writers, as they are concerned to be as objective in self-judgment as possible. Three volumes of the series dealing with theology have appeared. In the first volume, dated 1925, an American, William Adams Brown, has the first place; then follow Adolf Deissmann, Ludwig Ihmels, Rudolf Kittel, Adolf Schlatter, Reinhold Seeberg, I. R. Slotemaker de Bruine (a Dutchman), and Theodor Zahn. In the second volume, dated 1926, are included Karl Beth (an Austrian), Karl Girgensohn (from Livland), Hans Lietzmann, Friedrich Loofs, Otto Procksch, and Erich Schaeder. The third volume, dated 1927, which has just appeared, deals with Catholic Theologians, and includes Bernhard Bartmann, Hartmann Grisar, S.J., Joseph Mausbach, Norbert Peters, Franz Sawicki, Joseph Schmidlin, and Heinrich Schrörs. Most, if not all, of these names are familiar to informed students of the day because valued for their contributions to sacred learning. Each autobiography is accompanied by an excellent photograph, and a bibliography in some form.

The editor of the series is Licentiate Erich Stange, and the publisher, Verlag von Felix Meiner, Leipzig. The price, which in comparison with British prices seems moderate, of each volume is 12 Reichmarks. Such a volume it is impossible to review. One can only call attention to its varied, valuable contents, and express cordial appreciation to the writers for their confessions, and sincere gratitude to the editor and publishers for their enterprise. If it be true that *pectus facit theologum*, then the autobiographical method can be heartily welcomed in theology.

ALFRED E. GARVIE.

London.

[1] *Religionswissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellung* (Verlag von Felix Meiner; i. 1925, ii. 1926, iii. 1927).

Dr. Holtzmann's Commentary.

WHETHER the explanation be the greater industry of German scholars or the greater modesty of British scholars, the one-man commentary on the New Testament has had a longer vogue in Germany than in Britain. That the task is still not beyond the capacity of one man is shown by the completion of Dr. Oskar Holtzmann's translation of and commentary on *Das Neue Testament*.[2] The present issue, being the second and concluding part of vol. ii., contains the Pastorals (in the order 2 Ti., Titus, 1 Ti.), Hebrews, the so-called Catholic Epistles, the Revelation, and the Fourth Gospel.

In rejecting the traditional authorship of 'James,' he remarks that if a brother of Jesus had written it, this would have been made plain; while a pseudonymous writer wishing to shelter under the name of this James would have made his claim openly. '1 Peter' is addressed (among others) to the Pauline Churches of Galatia and Asia. Paul's controversy with the Judaizers was specially bitter in connexion with the Galatian Churches, and in this controversy Peter took the other side. (Surely this is putting the point much too strongly.) Peter, then, could hardly have paid the compliment we find in 1 P 5^{12} to the Pauline Gospel and to Paul's travelling companion, Silvanus. In any case Peter was dead before there was such a persecution in Asia Minor as is presupposed in this letter. The well-known emendation of 1 P 3^{19} (adopted by Moffatt), which makes Enoch the preacher to the spirits in prison, is not mentioned; but the suggestion is offered that 3^{19-22} is a later addition to the letter.

'Hebrews' is regarded as a patchwork of addresses given on different occasions. Dr. Holtzmann follows those who find in the passage 5^{11-16} three indications that the writer is a teacher, perhaps a bishop, who is instructing pupils, perhaps deacons (6^{10}). He 13^{7-17} is a protest against the view that in the Lord's Supper the Christian be-

[2] In two volumes, Alfred Töpelmann, Giessen. M.33.

comes a participator in Christ by eating His body, a view which Paul is supposed to encourage in 1 Co 10^{3-16}. One proof is that the word σῶμα (v.[11]) is not found in the Old Testament reference (Lv 16^{27}), but is taken from the New Testament account of the Last Supper.

The reference to the Twelve Apostles in 21^{14} shows that the Revelation is not the work of an apostle. Dr. Holtzmann suggests that the author was Junias, Paul's fellow-countryman and predecessor in the faith, a man of note among the apostles, to whom he sends greetings in Ro 16^{7}. Junias is another form of John. The number of the beast is 616. No one would change the mystic number 666 into 616, but the reverse process is easily intelligible. The reference must be to the value of the Greek (not Hebrew) letters of the man's name. Dr. Holtzmann revives his old suggestion of ΓΑΙΟC ΚΑΙCΑΡ, but believes now that the secret name is not that of Caligula, but rather that of the dictator, Julius Cæsar, and his adopted son and heir Augustus.

Some of the divergences of the Fourth Gospel from the first three had already been foreshadowed in the Synoptics. Luke, for example, has a farewell discourse at the Last Supper, and has three cries from the Cross in consonance with the Church's conception of Jesus instead of the cry of dereliction in Mk from Ps 22^{1}. In Jn 13 there is no account of the Institution of the Lord's Supper (the author has given his views on that in 6^{53-58}), but instead Jesus speaks of a washing which is essential to union with Himself. Dr. Holtzmann regards 13^{10} as a proposal to substitute baptism by foot-washing for total immersion. The Didache illustrates the practical inconveniences found in total immersion, but also establishes that John's proposal was not generally adopted. Again, the conception of the (ideal) figure of the one whom Jesus loved and who leaned on His bosom is based, it is suggested, on the Greek symposium.

J. F. McFadyen.

Kingston.

Paria.

These lectures[1] were given at Bonn in May of last year, and will be welcomed by the wide circle of those who know the clarity and force with which Harnack can speak. How did Christian theology arise? It is a great historical topic; and, as the author observes pointedly, while history nowhere has the last word, it must have the first word in a scientific discussion of Christianity. He deprecates the suggestion that the scholarship of the last forty years can be bowed out by new theologians in a hurry. At least it had the merit of trying to get at the facts.

The first two centuries of Christian thought form a complex development; here things are simplified for beginners. But only a master can teach beginners in this style. The lectures deal successively with the detachment of Christianity from Judaism and the rise of the Church; sources and authorities for preaching, theology, and dogma: the general outlines of the determinative Christian message; the first stage of Christian theology; and the origin of dogma. Harnack repudiates the theory which turns Jesus into a preacher of an eschatological kingdom: that is a view, he says, which is right in what it asserts, wrong in what it denies. The gospel was not a new idea but a fulfilled hope. The influential but difficult place of the Old Testament in the early Church is discussed in a particularly rewarding fashion; Marcion cut the knot unwisely, no doubt, when he decided to abolish it altogether as a Christian authority, but he was facing a real problem. The hypothesis which explains belief in Jesus' death and resurrection by contemporary myths, representing itself in this finding as the mouthpiece of historical science, is firmly repelled. So, too, is the theory that St. Paul brought over and attached to Jesus a ready-made Christology derived from the Messianic Dogmatic of later Judaism. The Pauline idea of pre-existence, Harnack suggests, did not signify anything so startling in that age as it would in ours. The following paragraph on the teaching of the Fourth Gospel is impressive: 'Behind the theology of John, as behind that of Paul, there lies, as starting-point and as object, a personal Christian experience, but Paul had the power to set this forth in a psychologically moving way. That power was denied to John; he expressed his truth, rather, in profound abstractions, the precise sense of which he left like-minded souls to fix. We misunderstand him if, out of these abstractions, we try to develop a metaphysical or gnostic system; they are all *religious* thoughts and have nothing more in common with the idealistic philosophy of the time and the Oriental mysteries-wisdom than certain terms—terms which in the one case and the other have a different sense and aim. The Johannine theology is Christian mysticism; its native soil, however, is not the Greek philosophy

[1] *Die Entstehung der christlichen Theologie und des christlichen Dogmas*, by Professor Adolf von Harnack (Gotha: Leopold Klotz, 1927; p. 90; M.2.50).

of religion, but the piety and mysticism of later Judaism.' Harnack's judgments have the largeness and depth of insight.

In subsequent pages Harnack is illuminative with regard to Marcion, on which he has lately done so much original work. He points out that Marcion sought to be a Bible theologian and nothing more, interpreting the Bible, too, in its natural sense. That might seem to make him a far-off precursor of the Reformers, but he paved the way for Catholicism by the way in which he identified faith, theology, and the doctrine of the Church.

What is here written about the Apologists is more familiar to readers of Harnack. The same is true of the brief sketch outlining the beginnings of official Christology. The Logos-idea did great harm, we are told; yet we should have thought it a more promising exponent of some great religious values bound up with faith in Jesus than the earth-born conceptions of Paul of Samosata, for whom Harnack betrays a certain tenderness. And yet we cannot but agree with his estimate of the pernicious influence of Stoic rationalism on the incipient theology of the Church—an influence which the inexpressibly valuable spiritual authority of the New Testament in real measure checked, to our great gain.

From the same publishing house comes an exceptionally attractive volume, bearing the title *Forty Years of the 'Christian World,'*[1] offered in gratitude and veneration to Professor Martin Rade, of Marburg. Rade has edited the important weekly ever since it was founded, from his thirtieth year to his seventieth. Near a hundred authors have contributed to the volume. Some describe the temper and influence of the journal; others give reminiscences of its origin and early years; still others tell what they have long owed to it; and others—for the book is hospitable—give reasons for dissociating themselves from it, in spite of their cordial regard for the editor. Harnack leads off with an affectionate letter to Rade, which does honour to both. The names of Deissmann, Gressmann, Gunkel, Jülicher, Loofs, Niebergall, Stephan, Titius, Wendt, Wobbermin occur in the list of writers, and are so well known over here as to vouch for the quality of the contents. It is a book pervaded by a singularly impressive spirit of high-minded and scholarly religion. Round the 'Christian World' of Germany there has gathered a band of brothers in the Christian faith, who believe alike in the gospel and in knowledge; and to Professor Rade, who has inspired and controlled their work for the journal, and who has himself simultaneously enriched theology with many a valuable book, we offer respectful and heartfelt congratulations.

[1] *Vierzig Jahre 'Christliche Welt'* (Klotz, 1927; M.5).

The firm of Klotz has also issued a proposed new service-book, suitable for Lutheran use throughout the Christian Year.[2] The book is founded on the Swedish work of Linderholm, but has been enlarged for Germany, in its second edition, by Knevels and Mensching, under the editorship of Professor Otto. The book is founded on the idea of the Kingdom of God, and the Christian Year with its rich and abundant services is grouped about this central thought. A real and successful attempt has been made to attain flexibility and beauty; and we can well suppose that the book will be employed widely, in private as in public, in school as in church. The readings are chosen with unusual judgment, and the prayers, short and full of devotion, have weight and solemnity and helpfulness. Certain psalms have been inserted, pointed for responsive reading.

H. R. Mackintosh.

Edinburgh.

[2] *Das Jahr der Kirche, in Lesungen und Gebeten* (M.10).

St. Paul and the Twelve.

By the Reverend W. Bartlett, M.A., Helmdon, Brackley.

The entrance of Saul, the persecutor of the Church, into the chosen company of the Twelve Apostles, was certainly an unexpected and probably a not altogether welcome intrusion. Things had so far been going well. The Name which had been exposed for derision above a felon's cross had become a power in Jerusalem. The little community which had started with one hundred and twenty names on its roll had grown so rapidly that the number five thousand had long ago been left

far behind (Ac 1^{15} 4^{4} 5^{14} 6^{7}). It must have seemed as if the city over which their Master had wept was on the way to becoming through faith in Him the joy of the whole earth. The thought of a crucified Messiah was apparently not such an 'offence' to the Jews at first as it afterwards became. Perhaps this was because in other respects the national faith, with its passionate patriotism and prejudice, was not attacked, but rather flattered. Ancient prophecies, of whose fulfilment little enough sign had been forthcoming for hundreds of years, might after all be verified. The 'seasons of refreshing' and the 'restoration of all things' might arrive with that coming of the Lord Jesus from heaven which was imminent. So the Apostles preached, and their preaching had been confirmed with signs and wonders. The Sadducees and chief priests had of course been 'sore troubled,' and had tried to put down the new sect, but had not dared to proceed to extreme measures, so evidently was it 'in favour with all the people.'

Christianity began its career as a reforming movement within the Jewish Church. Even if the command to go into all the world was given to them, just as it is set down in the last words of St. Matthew, the disciples would not give it quite the same interpretation that we do. They were to 'begin at Jerusalem,' and they naturally thought that the old covenant which centred in Jerusalem, was to go on as before. The new faith was to be added to the old, but not to replace or destroy it. No doubt among the thoughtful and devout Jews still 'looking for the redemption of Jerusalem,' there were many who saw that reform was needed, just as in the sixteenth century there were thoughtful and devout Churchmen who longed that the Church might be purified from corruptions and might set forth to achieve her God-given purpose. Such a reform of Judaism, dealing tenderly with ancient tradition and prejudice, might have avoided any abrupt break with the past, and the new faith might conceivably have remoulded and transformed the old. That was the natural hope of the Twelve. Had it been fulfilled, the result might perhaps have been much as if in the sixteenth century Erasmus had led the Reformation instead of Luther, and avoided at all costs a conflict with the papacy.

But earthquake and volcano have played their violent but necessary part in the formation of the earth, as well as the more regular action of wind and water. And shocks and disturbances have had their use in the formation both of civil society and of the Church. The first indication that the Church was not to continue always in the path of peaceful and orderly progress came with the ministry of Stephen. Appointed for the purpose of conciliating the new and increasing element of foreign or Greek-speaking Jews who were being drawn into the Church, with the original Hebrew stock, he soon showed that he shared the wider outlook and more liberal sympathies which they had imbibed in Alexandria and other places abroad. To say and teach publicly that 'the Most High dwelleth not in temples made with hands' was dangerous doctrine indeed, if the Temple was to be what it always had been. True, Solomon might have spoken almost the same words when he dedicated his own Temple. But words enshrined in the Bible may be accepted—and neglected—as long as they are left within its pages, but may rouse violent opposition when brought out and applied to present circumstances.

Circumcision, which soon became the burning question, is only incidentally mentioned in Stephen's one recorded speech, but we cannot doubt what he would have said about it if pressed to give an opinion. It was, after all, scarcely unfair for his enemies to charge him with a desire to 'change the customs,' a thing almost more dreaded and hated in religion than in other departments of life.

We do not know what Stephen might ultimately have said or done, or to what enlargement of belief and alteration of policy he might have led the Church, if he had lived. We do know that his new exposition of the gospel, successful as it was with the more liberal-minded Grecian Jews, set the tide of popularity flowing the other way, and brought down a storm of persecution which threatened to destroy the Church altogether.

It would therefore be quite natural if the 'tribulation that arose about Stephen' (Ac 11^{19}) arrested for the time the movement which he had started. True, Philip, the only one of his fellow-deacons of whom history says anything, continued on the lines of his action by preaching in Samaria, and the Apostles officially recognized his work there. But Philip was not of so outstanding a personality as Stephen, and preaching in Samaria, though a bold step, would not be so offensive to the Jews as attacking their cherished prejudices in their own citadel of Jerusalem. And it is significant that Christian refugees from Jerusalem, while they remained true to their faith wherever they went, and spread their Master's name, yet spoke the word 'to none save only the Jews' (Ac 11^{19}). Opinion seems to be going back to the belief that in the following verse the 'Grecians' of the Received Text and A.V., *i.e.* the Greek-speaking Jews, was

after all probably right, rather than the 'Greeks' of R.V. If so, it would seem that the 'Jews' of the previous verse must mean Jews who retained their national language and had no leaning towards Hellenic culture. If the dispersed members of the Church limited their intercourse to these, it may have been partly because, coming from Jerusalem themselves, they would naturally have closer relations with this section of Israel, and partly also because the previous, temporary influx of Hellenic Jews into the Church had opened a controversy in which they did not clearly see their way. They may have admired Stephen's boldness in confessing Jesus Christ, and yet been doubtful of his prudence in throwing down a challenge on a highly contentious matter.

In any case, the expression 'to none save only to Jews' suggests a limitation rather than an extension of scope, a contraction rather than expansion of aims, a retreat rather than an advance on the policy of Stephen. And even at Antioch it was only 'some of them' who took a wider view of their obligation, and spoke to Grecian Jews, or, if R.V. be right, to Gentile Greeks.

If this be so, the conversion of Saul and his introduction three years afterwards to the Apostles found the leaders of the Church in a stage of divided or imperfectly formed opinion. Stephen had opened up great questions, but they were not yet prepared to go as far as he had gone. They were not ready for a complete breach with the things that had hallowed their own childhood and had been the pride of their race. It must, I think, strike any thoughtful reader of the Bible that the attitude of the Apostles towards the new convert, as described in Ac 9^{26}, was chilling, suspicious, and even ungenerous. Surely they might have been readier to believe in Saul's sincerity. Why should they have waited for explanation and persuasion from Barnabas? Is it possible that another doubt entered their minds? If it was three years since his conversion, and the larger part of the time had been spent in Damascus, where he 'confounded the Jews'—the sojourn in Arabia being, as Lightfoot thinks, only an episode—then St. Paul's leading tenet of justification by faith and the attitude to the old covenant which it involved, must have been clearly established in his own mind, and generally known and discussed in all places which had communications with Damascus. He may have been, as he says, 'unknown by face unto the churches in Judæa,' and yet not unknown by reputation as one who had taken up and carried to even greater lengths the startling, uncompromising, and, as it may well have seemed at that time, even hazardous doctrine which Stephen had preached, but which had been allowed to drop since his death.

We cannot but feel that it would be more creditable to the Twelve, and more credible in itself, if their reluctance to receive Saul was due, not simply to the fear either that his profession of faith was mere hypocrisy—we ought not to suspect any one of hypocrisy without some evidence—or that his new zeal would not last—again an unworthy suspicion—but to the perception that his teaching and methods would differ from their own in important respects, and would inevitably raise difficulties and dissensions which they might well shrink from facing. Barnabas eventually overcame their reluctance, and they accepted his co-operation. But almost at once it roused angry passions, and there was a plot to kill him, as Stephen had been killed. The plot proceeded from unconverted 'Grecian Jews,' because it was to them principally that Saul, like Stephen, addressed himself. 'The brethren' got him safely away to Cæsarea, and thence to Tarsus, where, apparently, they were content that he should remain. Nothing more is heard of him until some two or three years afterwards Barnabas fetched him to Antioch, where he at once assumes a position of equal authority, and even superior importance to the original Apostles.

But why did not this happen before? And why was it left to Barnabas to introduce him to a sphere worthy of his abilities? It must have been plain that Saul was capable of replacing, and more than replacing, the loss of Stephen. Yet the leaders of the Church show no desire to employ him. Saul no doubt forgave, but he cannot have forgotten the intentional oversight.

It is generally admitted that the Tübingen school, however wrong in its conclusions, has at least made the Acts a more intelligible, and certainly a more interesting, book. Different parties or 'schools of thought' existed in the early Church, as they have done later, and controversy sometimes became acute. St. Paul's Epistles give us glimpses of relations between himself and the other Apostles which were often uncomfortable and sometimes strained. These differences would form a topic of discussion in the Church long afterwards. Such discussion would tend to magnify them; they became a stumbling-block to devout Christians and a danger to the Church. St. Luke was perfectly right in trying to reduce their extent and importance. He lays stress on the essential agreement

between the two sections of the Church. But Luke wrote for men of his own day, when the humanity of the Apostles was not likely to be forgotten. He did not contemplate a period when these very human people, who were, as they said, 'of like passions' with ourselves, would be represented in pictures and statues in conventional attitudes and ecclesiastical garb, with halos round their heads, and as unlike as possible to any men or women whom we have ever seen.

True, they were filled with the Holy Spirit, but the Holy Spirit did not at once remove all their previous prepossessions and ingrained prejudices, their natural characteristics, their inevitable limitations, or endow them with a miraculous prevision of the course that events were going to take. If their Master Himself had often found them 'slow of heart' and wondered that they did not understand, so perhaps did the Holy Ghost who had come to teach them in His place. The wonder is not that they were changed so slowly, but that they were changed at all; not that they were sometimes afraid of the wide, uncharted land into which new truth would lead them, not that they advanced with hesitation and sometimes went back on their own word, but that they did advance. If they did not always lead boldly, they at least suffered themselves to be led into unfamiliar regions of thought.

I suppose that when we first read the Acts of the Apostles, the 15th seemed rather a dull chapter. The discussion proceeds smoothly to its foregone conclusion. It is like a friendly action at law brought for the purpose of registering an authoritative declaration on a matter as to which both parties are already agreed. It is only when we have read the Epistle to the Galatians that we begin to realize what passions and prejudices had been stirred up, how bitter was the controversy, how intense the excitement, how uncertain the issue must for a long time have seemed. In the end James, Cephas, and John gave to Paul and Barnabas the right hand of fellowship. So St. Paul himself tells us. But for a considerable time it must have seemed to both sides well-nigh impossible that Paul and the senior Apostles should remain members of the same Church. In default of a better explanation, we may accept the ordinary view that Gal 2^{1-10} refers to the same occasion as Ac 15, but it must be confessed that two such different accounts of the Council at Jerusalem can scarcely be received without some qualification.

Early in his career St. Paul had seen that his presentation of the gospel would make little headway with strict Jews or with the Churches in Judea. Of the proselytes who hung loosely, like a sort of fringe, round the synagogues of Gentile cities, there was more hope. But he soon turned definitely to the Gentiles. Much as he loved his countrymen, what else could he do, when they had 'thrust the gospel from them and judged themselves unworthy of eternal life'? He had foreseen that it would be so, or it had been revealed to him. We may put it either way. His own reason and the illumination of the Spirit had shown him that he was to be the Apostle of the Gentiles.

Therefore he had dropped circumcision as an article of the faith; he had dropped the Sabbath in the same way; neither was obligatory or even desirable for pagan converts, though Jewish believers would naturally still regard both as sacred ordinances. He had also dropped the distinction between clean and unclean meats, and could sit down to a meal with Gentiles, which Peter found it so hard to do.

But here the question interposes itself, Had not Peter been the first to do this, and the first to incur the reproach from the dominant party in the Church, that he had eaten with men uncircumcised? Had he not by his own word and deed declared that circumcision was not an essential condition of membership of the Christian Church? The story of Cornelius is so difficult to reconcile with the subsequent action of St. Peter as portrayed by St. Paul that we cannot wonder that its veracity has been suspected. No reasonable critic, however, would deny that St. Luke would not have related it, if he had not had good reasons for believing it to be true. And we may well suppose that in this instance St. Peter had been led not only further than the general feeling of the Church was prepared to follow, but further than he himself would have gone in a more deliberate course of action. He had been carried away by a generous impulse which prevented him from reflecting on the probable consequences of what he did. If he afterwards drew back, it may have been not simply from cowardice and the pressure of Judaistic opinion. With the controversy raging round him and threatening to split the Church in twain, he may well have wondered whether some concession should not be made to the natural and perfectly sincere prejudices of his own friends and fellow-believers. Erasmus would have said to him, 'You can see the truth, but they cannot. Do not force it upon them. They will be more enlightened some day. In the meantime you need not believe as they do, but neither need you upset the whole Church about it.' Erasmus would have given this

advice. Luther would not. But Luther and Paul were both difficult men to get on with, and spent their days and their strength in strife and turmoil.

Surely no correspondence that has ever been published contains such amazing indiscretions as St. Paul's Epistles to the Galatians and Corinthians. He seems recklessly to fling stones through the stained-glass window figures of Apostles and the conventional pictures of the harmonious progress of the early Church. Twice he describes the three Christian chiefs at Jerusalem as 'they who were of repute,' or 'they who seemed to be somewhat,' and the second time he adds, 'whatsoever they were it maketh no matter to me; God accepteth not man's person.' This is followed by the statement, 'they imparted nothing to me,' which clearly means that they had nothing to impart. One would say that a man who used such expressions about his colleagues rather meant to imply that they had too spacious an idea of their own importance in the scheme of things, and a little overrated their own wisdom. Almost more suggestive, though less particular, is the designation given twice in 2 Co 11^5 and 12^{11}, 'the very chiefest apostles,'[1] or to take the R.V. marginal rendering, 'those pre-eminent apostles.' The revisers surely had a glimmering of an idea which it would have been too rash to put into the text, that St. Paul was actually poking fun at his seniors. Stained-glass window saints do not poke fun at one another. They are not so disrespectful or so forgetful of ecclesiastical decorum. They duly hold up three fingers in the episcopal gesture of benediction. And there is a truth in sacred art. The Apostles brought and still bring the benediction of God upon mankind. But we need not the less hold fast to this truth, because we sometimes remember that they were men of flesh and blood. We shall not love Paul the less if he sometimes smiled at the inconsistencies and pettinesses into which Peter and James floundered in their anxiety to propitiate the 'die-hards.' Nor shall we love Peter the less because of his honest perplexities in this puzzling world, and his not always successful attempts to devise a compromise that would be acceptable to everybody.

[1] Chrysostom and most later commentators take the words as signifying Peter, James, and John, like the parallel expression in Galatians. So evidently did our translators when they gave the phrase a respectful turn, 'the very chiefest apostles.' To take it as referring to the 'false apostles' (2 Co 11^{13}) is almost indefensible. These are spoken of not with gentle irony, but stern indignation.

To the conservative party in the Church St. Paul's position must have always seemed something like that of an intruder. If ordination means the laying-on of hands, he had never been ordained. He repudiated the idea that his apostleship had been in any sense given him 'from men' or 'through man,' and would certainly not have allowed that the ceremony described in Ac 13^3 was necessary to make him an Apostle. One hardly likes to think what language he would have used if any one on the other side had suggested that he should submit to the 'conditional ordination' which is sometimes suggested as a happy expedient for healing up our modern divisions. He remains the first and greatest example of the truth that, while God works ordinarily through regular means and a duly appointed ministry, we must be ready to recognize other manifestations of His grace. 'The wind bloweth where it listeth.'

Another reflection suggested by the differences between St. Paul and the Twelve is that the Church in its best days was not free from internal difficulties. Relations were strained almost to the breaking-point. Disruption seemed inevitable. Yet it did not come. Two irreconcilable views were held within the Church, and each side respected the other. St. Paul and the Twelve worked in different spheres, 'that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision,' but the right hand of fellowship was given and not withdrawn. And slowly the truth prevailed.

Lastly, it is salutary to be reminded how very difficult it is for us to understand one another. It looks as if the Twelve can never have felt quite at home with St. Paul. They were never sure what he would do next, or whom he would offend. St. James's attempt in Ac 21 to keep the peace between St. Paul and the extreme Jewish section of the Jerusalem Church has a touch of naïveté about it, and even of pathos. To James the Church of Jerusalem was *the* Church. The Gentile Churches were rather troublesome hangers-on, for whom special dispensations of questionable legality were always being demanded. He urges Paul to show by an act of piety in full accordance with the old traditions that he is still at heart one of themselves and an upholder of 'the customs.' Paul defers to his advice, but must have foreseen that it would be useless. James was unable to control his own following. A riot broke out, and St. Paul never appeared in Jerusalem again. The two chiefs had done their best to make a pact which should unite their parties. But they themselves looked at the question from different points of view.

To Paul the attitude of James at Jerusalem, as of Cephas at Antioch, may well have seemed timid and even narrow. To them Paul himself must have appeared, as we sometimes describe an opponent, 'a good man but extreme in his views.' Both had their place. If we magnify the Apostle who is so dear to us all, we need not depreciate the Twelve. 'There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit.' 'And there are diversities of workings, but the same God who worketh all things in all.' And St. Paul did not forget that the greatest of all gifts is love.

Contributions and Comments.

'Individualistic' Interpretations.

It is well that writers on the New Testament should be warned against 'forcing the facts' of history to fit the framework of their own preconceptions. The caution is certainly needed; for, by a judicious selection of some facts and the ignoring of others, history can be made to prove almost anything. Yet perhaps it should be borne in mind by those who read history in the light of traditional views, as well as by others who are drawn into unconventional paths of thought. I am led to make these remarks by a review, in many respects kindly, of my recent book, *Christianity as Life* (in the last issue of this magazine). The reviewer charges me with wresting facts in order to support certain Quaker views of Christianity; but I think that most of his charges are wide of the mark.

It is true that, in maintaining the 'way of love' as Christ's way of overcoming evil, I made no allusion to the cleansing of the Temple. The omission was deliberate, because I see no evidence (in the reports we have) that physical force was used on the buyers and sellers. The 'scourge of cords' is only mentioned in Jn 2^{15}, and there it is said to have been used on the sheep and oxen. In any case, what could one man's strength of arm have done against the multitude of traffickers? The incident is surely a case of the triumph of spiritual over material force. Another charge is that I set aside Christ's teaching about Judgment, as due to the apocalyptic ideas of the Evangelists. As a fact I did not set it aside, but endeavoured to interpret it in the light of the Johannine teaching (p. 49 f.); and this interpretation was preceded by a rather careful analysis of the differing emphasis given to it by the three Synoptists, in order to show that the way in which they reported it was coloured by their several preconceptions. Further, my statement (p. 27) that the demand for love to enemies had primary reference to the Roman oppressors of the nation is not an 'arbitrary' bit of Quaker argument; I have met with it in expositions of the Sermon on the Mount by leading scholars who are not Quakers, and to some of these references are given.

As regards the Sacraments, it seems to me very unfair to represent me as *arbitrarily* rejecting Paul's account of the words of institution at the Last Supper. I made it quite clear (p. 170) that the reason for rejecting them is that they are not in the Synoptic account as originally written (the passage containing 'this do' in Lk $22^{19f.}$ having been drawn from 1 Co $11^{24f.}$). If the words had been uttered as Paul reports them, it seems impossible that the Synoptists should have omitted them. I am forced to the conclusion that Mark goes behind the Pauline tradition and corrects it. It is not I who have 'forced the facts' to support a theory. The belief that the Sacraments rest on the authority of the Church and not on that of Jesus Himself is no piece of Quaker 'individualism'; it is held by many of the foremost New Testament students, who still support their use in the Church, and I have no doubt that before long it will be generally accepted among scholars—just as Protestant scholars all reject the Roman Catholic claim that five other Sacraments were instituted by Jesus. On the broader matter of the prophetic conception of religion I have not 'forgotten' the symbolism of the Old Testament prophets; but I agree with the statement in The Expository Times, August 1927, p. 484, that 'the prophets rejected material sacrifices as a non-essential and misleading part of religion.'

Again, the reviewer objects to my statement (p. 110) that 'the Spirit means for Paul the living personality of Jesus,' without noting that on a previous page (83), to which reference is given, I carefully state that the identification was for Paul 'half-conscious,' that there were reasons why it was difficult to make, that the best minds in the

early Church were moving in that direction, and that in the Fourth Gospel the identification is quite clear and conscious. EDWARD GRUBB.

Letchworth.

[This note sets out admirably the Quaker position, and we are glad to give space to it.—EDS.]

'The Chaldaeans.'

MR. H. H. ROWLEY'S paper in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES of June 1927, on 'The "Chaldæans" in the Book of Daniel,' raises many interesting questions, but it does not by any means solve them.

(1) He states that 'The Chaldæans were a Semitic people, whose home was in the coastal regions south of Babylon, but whose language "was the Babylonian cuneiform, almost identical grammatically and lexically with the Assyrian." Their inscriptions are in this language, and it is certain that this was the language of the government.' I do not dispute that their home was in the coastal regions south of Babylon, nor that the language of the inscriptions was the Semitic Akkadian. But I ask, What proof is there that the Chaldæans were a Semitic people, or that their language, or that the language of the Government, was Semitic? On the contrary, they were *Sumerians*, and their language was *Sumerian*—a tongue unknown to the Semitic Babylonians and Assyrians. Hence Daniel and his companions had to be *taught* it (Dn 1^4). That the language of the law, and of official despatches to other parts of the Empire, was Akkadian, is no evidence that it was the current tongue, any more than the Latin of the Middle Ages. The Aramæan dockets prove the contrary.

(2) It is not denied that in the times of Herodotus and later, long after the subjugation of Babylonia by the Persians, the Greek historians represented the Chaldæans as having become a caste of wise men, and later still as a priestly caste. But what proof is there that any of the wise men, astrologers, etc., mentioned in Daniel as *in the time of Nebuchadrezzar*, were *priests* or had anything to do with religion? I can find nothing in the Book of Daniel which associates these men with priestcraft or with the religion of Chaldæa. Nor can I find anything in the cuneiform inscriptions which shows that diviners, astrologers, soothsayers, etc., were *priests* (šaknu). That the priests of the different gods practised divination is one thing. That all diviners, soothsayers, sorcerers, etc., were necessarily *priests* is quite a different matter. On the contrary, we have specimens of incantations (šiptu, the same root as the 'enchanters' of Dn 1^{20} 2^2, etc. etc.), directed *against* the sorcerers (Kaššap, the same word as the 'sorcerers' of Dn 2^2, Dt 18^6, etc.), showing that the latter were commonly *feminine*, answering exactly to the *witches* of 'Macbeth,' and equally detested, but certainly *not* connected with the priesthood. The *šangu*, and the *barū*, and the *mašmašu*, and the *rab-ešrete*, who *were* priests, are not mentioned in Daniel.

(3) Mr. Rowley says: 'If the priesthood of Bel constituted the "Chaldæans" and consisted exclusively of men of the Chaldæan race, then Daniel is plainly unhistorical, for it represents a group of Hebrew youths as being selected for admission to the order (1^4), and a Hebrew as being exalted to the position of chief of the order (2^{48}).' Whence, I ask, does he learn that they were admitted to any order? There is no indication in the Book that any of them exercised any but *political* authority ($2^{48.\ 49}$). Daniel was made 'rab-signin' (a political title) *over* all the wise men of Babylon—a very wise precaution. All the terms used of Daniel and the three other youths in Dn $1^{4.\ 17.\ 20}$ are of the most innocent kind, and relate in no way to either priesthood or magic.

(4) There is no suggestion of any *order* of priests or otherwise, in Daniel. Nebuchadrezzar commanded *all the wise men* in Babylon of every sort to be destroyed (2^{12}). There was no caste, no order. Mr. Rowley, like many others, has confused the 'wise men' with the *priests*.

(5) The simple fact is that the 'Chaldæans' of Daniel were the men who could read and write the ancient Sumerian literature of Chaldæa, in which the ancient lore of the race was enshrined. 'Learning' in Dn $1^{4.\ 17}$ is 'seper,' *i.e.* the art of *writing*. Some of them may, or may not, have been priests. But it was not as priests that any one was summoned. It was solely as learned men of different kinds that the king wanted their services.

(6) I do not believe that Sumerian ever became an extinct language. It was the Semitic 'Akkadian' that became extinct quite early in history, and it was replaced by Aramaic. But only the (Sumerian) Chaldæan learned men could read and write the Sumerian *characters* in which both Sumerian and Akkadian were written.

(7) The Book of Daniel was written by a *Jew* for *Jews*, and the meaning and appropriateness of the terms used depend entirely upon how they were understood by the *Jews* at a certain time, not by the Babylonians or the Greeks. Hence Dr. Dick Wilson's analogy of a 'Grecian' is perfectly appro-

priate in the composition of a *Jew* writing in Elam (8^2) under Cyrus, King of Persia (1^{21}), and for Jews.

GEO. B. MICHELL.

Cairo.

Romans xii. 13, 14.

OMIT ὑμῶν with Westcott and Hort and Eberhard's texts, and omit arbitrary full stop after διώκοντες. Translate 'pursuing the (dispensing of) hospitality; bless those pursuing it, bless them and do not curse (abuse them).' Paraphrase: 'Be generous hosts. You who are guests speak well of your hosts and do not malign them,' etc.

διώκω—in N.T. is a perfectly neutral word not necessarily carrying the meaning of 'persecute.' St. Paul (unless this instance be an exception) happens only to use it in Romans in a good sense = 'make pursuit of.'

φιλοξενιάν is referred to in the second use of the word διώκω. διώκοντας must be followed by IT, referring to hospitality. This is a most common usage in N.T. and Sept. *E.g.*, in the institution of the Lord's Supper (Mt 26^{26}): 'As they were eating, Jesus took bread and blessed IT, and brake IT, and gave IT to the disciples.' What does the IT refer to? ἄρτον, 'bread,' and so φιλοξενίαν is referred to in the passage above. It may be observed that, had διώκω suggested persecution to St. Paul's mind, he would have been likely to follow up the idea at once and not defer it till the seventeenth verse, where the attitude towards persecution and enemies is worked out.

It is a matter of surprise that even those interpreters who give an alternative reading, omitting ὑμῶν, have none of them given the alternative rendering which the text before them demands!

I do not feel quite certain that, even if ὑμῶν be retained, the meaning would not be 'bless those entertaining *you* hospitably.'

The Didache throws an interesting light on hospitality in the Church (a hospitality which St. Paul sometimes refers to), *Did.* ch. xii.: 'provide, according to your understanding, that no idler live with you as a Christian. Then if he will not act according to this, he is a "Christmonger"; beware of such. χριστεμπορός ἐστι: προσέχετε ἀπὸ τῶν τοιούτων.' Travellers and prophets might come to look upon entertainment by Christian hosts as their right, and it is easy to see that some of the less spiritual, if they were suspects of being χριστέμποροι might meet with 'lenten entertainment' and might anything but bless their hosts. St. Paul might very well have had this in view, and so exhort guests to speak well of and bless their entertainers, to bless them and not to curse them!

R. P. ASHE.

South Croydon.

Entre Nous.

A Child's Religion.

In June 1918 there was born the first grandchild of the Bishop of Derby, little Elisabeth June, the daughter of Molly and Rupert Browne-Wilkinson. From the time that Elisabeth was two and a half her mother kept a diary. The diary ends a few days after her seventh birthday, when she died suddenly. It has now been published by the S.P.C.K.—*Elisabeth June: Her Mother's Diary* (1s. net). In his introductory note the Bishop of Derby makes the suggestion that a fund be raised to train some one at St. Christopher's College, Blackheath, whose work afterwards will be to help mothers to understand God's plan for the growing of their children. Any one who finds help in the story of Elisabeth may send a gift towards the training to Mrs. A. R. Browne-Wilkinson, 22 St. John's Park, Blackheath, London, S.E. 3.

Elisabeth found the Lord Jesus in her home, and He came to be her best friend. One of the early notes in the diary is about her prayers. At two and a half her mother says: 'Her prayers, which are almost entirely thanksgivings, get lovelier and lovelier, and her observation and appreciation of beauty that come out in them rejoice my heart, with my awful aptitude for taking things for granted. Gardening with me one day, she watched with joy an old toad on the rockery. For ten days after that no prayers started without: "Thank Him for that little hopping thing." . . . Last night I had prayers with her; after thanking for "such happy days, and those games," she said, "I want *you* to say thank you for finding a cook" (a much-needed and satisfactory one had arrived ten days before). Fancy the child realizing what a godsend it was! That same night, with her thumb in her

mouth and very, very sleepy: "And thank Him for putting the pink on the daisies."

'On Good Friday, after talking to me as she dressed, she told her father on her own initiative at breakfast, "It's called Good Friday to-day 'cos on a Friday Jesus put out His arms and said, 'I love you.'" '

At four, Elisabeth's favourite author was Robert Louis Stevenson, and already she is showing a love of language and a delicate imagination. In August 1922 there is the entry, 'To-day we've been for a picnic, and when I found some harebells and took them to her and said "Look at these, they're harebells." "Of blue, he slips his hands through," she quoted with only a second's pause (and I've only read her the poem half a dozen times), her eyes sparkling with joy at seeing and understanding. As she held them coming up the drive and lifted one bell on her finger, I heard her say very gently, "That's the beauty of them, they droop their heads." '

Another very delightful little story about Elisabeth—this time Elisabeth in trouble—is told about a day in the summer of 1924 when her mother had been away for the day and found that she had been very disobedient to the maid in charge. 'When I spoke to her about it, she said: "Yes, I know, Mummy—I am a very naughty little girl, I *am*. But it's her iffishness. I wouldn't be so naughty if she didn't say, '*If* you do that——' 'If you don't go.'" How often since then I've caught myself being "iffish." '

Conscience at Five.

'"D'you know, Mummy, I sometimes hear—and it's not in my heart, and it's not me saying it—but I sometimes hear 'Elisabeth, do that,' and there's nobody there. And sometimes it says—you know as it does in my heart when something naughty comes in—'Go away—get out—no, I shan't do it.' Only it's *not* in my heart."

'I asked her "Do you mean you hear it with these ears, as now, when I'm speaking?"

'E. "Yes—like that—only there's nobody there. I look round and there's no one. And it's not in my heart nor me speaking," she repeated.' [1]

Reading of the Bible.

In 1926 Sir Rider Haggard published his autobiography with the title 'The Days of my Life.' The chapter dealing with his religious life has now been reprinted—*A Note on Religion* (Longmans; 1s. net). What are seekers after truth to do? He replies, turn to the New Testament and to parts of the Old Testament such as the Psalms. They will find it there and not elsewhere.

'I suppose that for the last fifteen or twenty years, except very occasionally through accident or a sense of unworthiness, scarcely a day has gone over my head on which I have not once (the last thing at night), and often more than once, read a portion of the Bible. The result is that now I find it fresher, stronger, more convincing, more full of hidden meaning than I did when I began this exercise. "Search the Scriptures" was a very great and potent saying, for in them, I think, is life. What, it may be asked, do you find there, beyond picturesque narrative and the expression of hopes natural to the hearts of members of a race that, in a few short years, must throb itself to silence? I answer that in all their *main* facts they are *true*. I have been accustomed to write fiction for a space of nearly a whole generation, and I know something of the business.

'Having this experience at my back, I declare earnestly that, with a single exception, I do not think it possible that the Gospels and the rest can be the work of man's imagination. That exception is the Book of Revelation, which might possibly have been conceived by some noble human mind in a wonderful period of spiritual exaltation. I hasten to add that I am certain this was not the case; that, on the contrary, it was divinely inspired. All I say is that, in my view, it alone of the books of the New Testament *might* perhaps be the fruit of human powers of creation.

Striving of the Spirit.

'Surely it is the attitude and strivings of the caged spirit that will be considered, not the shortcomings of the gaoler body, the desire not the deeds, for if it prove otherwise who can escape when the heart is weighed in the balance? To my mind the great sin is not to seek forgiveness for sins—not to try to avoid them in the future. All stumble into the mire, but of those who elect to wallow there and of those who deliberately refuse the saving hand that is stretched out to them, what can be said? Well, perhaps they may be given other opportunities elsewhere. As a believer in the infinite mercy of God I dare to trust that this will be so.

'I desire to urge, however, upon any who care to listen, these three things which I myself have learned in the course of years. First, the enormous importance of all this matter. Secondly, the folly of sin. Thirdly, since it needs must be that offences will come, the urgent need of repentance before in

[1] *Elisabeth June: Her Mother's Diary*, 50.

some other life or lives we are called upon to reap the harvest of that unrepented folly.'[1]

Gn. xxvi. 8.

'Now we come to an interesting little link, namely, the way in which the Bedawy tents are pitched facing towards the north part of the mound. This custom accounts for that rather remarkable point which most people might wonder at, that Abimelech looked out of his window and saw into a Bedawy tent. Here we see that it is possible to look straight into the tents pitched below. That is one of those little trifles which show how remarkably exact are the incidental descriptions in the narratives, even as far back as the time of Isaac.'[2]

At the last annual meeting of the *Palestine Exploration Fund*, which was held in the end of June, Professor Flinders Petrie gave an account of his excavations at Gerar. Tell Jemmeh, which is believed to be the ancient Gerar, is nine miles to the south of Gaza, in country which is quite uninhabited except for the Bedawy in tents. These have proved excellent workmen, and none of the valuable finds which have been made at Tell Jemmeh have been lost. The articles in the number include 'First Report of the New Excavations on Ophel,' 'Tell en-Nasbeh Expedition of the Pacific School of Religion,' and an account of 'Two Inscriptions from Beisan' and 'The Lion and the Cavern of Bones at Petra.'

Gerald Gould.

A slender volume of new poems by Gerald Gould should not be missed. They are published by Ernest Benn—in attractive black and white binding—at 3s. 6d. net, and the title is taken from one of the poems—*Beauty the Pilgrim*. The volume contains ten short poems, and a longer one, 'The Mountain Eagle.' We quote the second poem:

THE COMPANION.

He found my house upon the hill.
I made the bed and swept the floor,
And laboured solitary, till
He entered at the open door.

He sat with me to break my fast:
He blessed the bread and poured the wine,
And spoke such friendly words, at last
I knew not were they his or mine;

But only, when he rose and went
And left the twilight in the door,
I found my hands were more content
To make a bed and sweep a floor.

[1] H. Rider Haggard, *A Note on Religion*, p. 33.

[2] Professor Sir Flinders Petrie in *Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statement*, July 1927, p. 139.

John S. Hoyland.

Some time ago we noticed 'The Sacrament of Common Life.' We now have from Mr. Hoyland, *The Sacrament of Nature* (Heffer; 2s. 6d. net), and we quote from it a prayer of thanksgiving and a prayer of supplication:

LXVII.

We thank Thee, Father, this day
For the wild free life of the forest,
For wind and sky,
For hills untrodden by man,
For valleys and hurrying streams,
For flowers strewing the steep mountain-pastures,
For the joyous and carefree life of the birds,
We thank Thee, O Father,
For these Thy goodly and marvellous gifts.

LXXI.

Master,
Make me more wholly Thine own:

My mind is so restless,
So fickle and changeful,
I long for Thy quiet strength,
Thy power of fullest self-giving,
Thy generous joy in the good of Thy creatures:

I long that Thy deathless beauty
Shining ever renewed in Nature and true human love
May shine through me unto men:

Mould me aright to Thy will,
Which is beauty and love,
And make me, O Master, Thy servant, Thy tool.

Erratum.

Kindly note that in the September issue, page 541, the sermon is by Professor W. Emery Barnes, and not, as stated, by the Bishop of Birmingham.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In the last week of September the British Society for Old Testament Study held its eighteenth meeting at Keble College, Oxford, and the interest of the occasion was greatly enhanced by the presence of many distinguished Old Testament scholars from other lands. In point of numbers as well as quality Germany was particularly well represented, both in the papers read and in the subsequent discussions. Professor Volz of Tübingen spoke on 'The God of Moses'; Professor Hempel, who has succeeded the late Professor Gressmann in the editorship of the 'Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft,' spoke on 'The Type of Piety peculiar to Old Testament Religion'; Professor Eissfeldt of Halle discussed Old Testament narratives; Professor Gunkel was represented in his absence by a paper—translated and read by Dr. T. H. Robinson—on 'A Re-investigation of the Chronology of the Psalms in the Light of Literary History'; and Professor Hans Schmidt of Giessen discussed certain Old Testament prayers.

Holland was represented by Professor Eerdmans of Leiden with a paper on Deuteronomy; France, by Professor A. Lods of Paris, who spoke on the rôle of magical ideas in Israelite mentality, and Professor Causse of Strasburg, who dealt with the development of the Jewish diaspora in the fifth century B.C.; while America was represented by Professor J. M. P. Smith of Chicago, who criticised the current translations of Gn 1^{1-3}. Britain was admirably represented by Mr. Driver and Dr. G. A. Cooke of Oxford, Professors Bevan and S. A. Cook of Cambridge, and others; and alike in the discussion of the religion, the literature, and the language the British scholars offered contributions which were entirely worthy of their distinguished guests. The representatives of each nationality felt that they had learned much from one another. The conference furnished a fine illustration of the power of scholarship and scientific interests to bring the nations together.

One of the most thought-provoking papers was that of Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley on 'Israel and its Religious Environment'—a paper which raised the problem of the relation of Israel's religious thought to that of other nations. It is pretty generally acknowledged that Israel adopted and assimilated, if not much, certainly something from the nations with which she came into contact. But is this all? As others influenced her, did she not also influence others?

That is the interesting problem to which Dr. Oesterley has also addressed himself in *The Wisdom of Egypt and the Old Testament* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net). The discussion turns round the teaching of the Egyptian sage Amen-em-ope, which was first published four years ago by Sir Ernest Wallis Budge; and by his vivid account of this book and its historical implications Dr. Oesterley has rendered a valuable service to all students of the Old Testament. The book belongs to the

Wisdom Literature, it is marked by an extraordinarily high moral and religious tone, it has remarkable affinities with the Book of Proverbs, and very especially with 22^{17}–23^{14}, and it was possibly known to, and used by, Ben-Sira.

A few quotations will reveal its affinity with the Book of Proverbs both in style and in thought :

Better is a bushel which God giveth thee
Than five thousand wrongly gained.

Again :

When thou hearest good or bad (of people)
Put it aside as though thou hadst not heard it :
Place the good upon thy tongue,
But let the evil be hidden within thee.

The golden rule is set forth in this graphic picture :

Suffer not a man to be left behind in crossing the stream,
While thou hast room and to spare in the ferry.

Rich alike in faith and beauty is the saying which announces the joy of the life hereafter :

How happy is he who hath reached the West
And is safe in the hand of God.

That there was some kind of relationship between the Wisdom Literatures of the ancient Oriental world seems beyond all doubt. The following quotation from the words of Achikar irresistibly recalls a passage from Proverbs : 'Withhold not thy son from the rod if thou canst keep him from wickedness. If I smite thee, my son, thou wilt not die ; and if I leave (thee) to thine own heart, thou wilt not live.' Surely this must be more than accidentally related to the words in Pr $23^{13f.}$:

Withhold not correction from the child,
For if thou beat him with the rod, he will not die.
Thou shalt beat him with the rod,
And shalt deliver his soul from Sheol.

The evidence justifies Dr. Oesterley in maintaining that there was much community of thought and religious conception between Israel and other nations in regard to things which used to be regarded as the unique possession of the former ; and the explanation lies in the fact that the scribes of various countries, who would be naturally chosen to travel on diplomatic business to the courts of other lands, would have frequent opportunities of coming into contact with one another.

In particular, there was admittedly very considerable intercourse between Israel and Egypt, and in his third chapter Dr. Oesterley carefully traces these contacts from the time of Solomon, who married an Egyptian princess, to the time of Jeremiah, when Israelitish colonies are known to have been established in Egypt. This contact must have been peculiarly powerful in the time of Isaiah, when there was a definite pro-Egyptian party in Judah. The fact that it was primarily a political contact would not exclude the interchange of religious influences and ideas.

This general influence, however, is not sufficient to account either for the singularly close resemblance between Amen-em-ope and the section of Proverbs already referred to, or for the no less than remarkable ethical and religious quality of the teaching of the Egyptian sage. Indeed, so remarkable is it that Dr. Oesterley can 'assert without fear of contradiction that the like is not to be found elsewhere in the ancient literature of pre-Christian times, with the one exception of the Hebrew Scriptures.' It would be idle, he thinks, to expect any trace of the influence of the religion of Israel upon foreign religions until the teaching of the eighth-century prophets had had time to fructify. But after that it becomes both possible and probable.

Some Egyptologists, indeed, place the book much earlier—in the tenth century, or even the sixteenth—while others place it later, as late as the Persian or even the Greek period, but Dr. Oesterley decides for a date later than the eighth century rather than before it, and thus accounts for its singularly high tone. 'Assuming that the Egyptian book was written after the high ethical teaching of the prophets had taken root and fructified among the finer spirits of their nation, it is *à priori* more

likely that Amen-em-ope would be influenced by the Old Testament writers than *vice versa*.'

The possible or probable relationship of the Teaching of Amen-em-ope to the Old Testament is not exhausted by its demonstrable relationship to Proverbs. Dr. OESTERLEY shows that that relationship may extend to the Book of Deuteronomy and the Psalms, if not further. Certainly the analogies between the first psalm and the Egyptian book are many and curious; those with Ps 22 are not quite so convincing. Even in Proverbs there are differences as well as points of contact. If between the Egyptian proverb—

> It (*i.e.* riches) hath surely made for itself wings,
> As an eagle that flieth heavenwards,

and the Hebrew—

> They have made for themselves wings like geese,
> And have flown into the heavens,

the relationship is as good as undeniable, despite the characteristic difference, on the other hand, the Egyptian book has nothing, either good or bad, to say about women, who so frequently appear in the pages of Proverbs.

But some of the phenomena can only be explained on the assumption of direct, and not merely general, influence. In some cases it is beyond all reasonable doubt that the compiler of Proverbs, or the author of the section in question, copied directly from the teaching of the Egyptian sage, though this sage in turn appears to have been profoundly influenced by Hebrew writings and 'so impressed by their spirit and teaching that he absorbed them, and, perhaps unconsciously, reproduced them to some extent in his own writing.'

Doubtless the theory of Hebrew influence upon foreign religions can be carried too far. It is surely carried too far, for example, in Professor Duff's suggestion that Æschylus' 'Prometheus Vinctus' is simply a Greek version of Is 53. But when we remember the perpetual contact of Israel with foreigners all through the centuries from the days of Solomon, who was visited doubtless by wise men as well as women from other lands, to the days of Nehemiah, who held office of the Persian court, we can be quite sure that Israel not only borrowed but gave, and thus—often perhaps all unconsciously—fulfilled the missionary dream of the great unknown prophet of the Exile.

One of the urgent needs of the present day is to secure a synthesis of Christianity with the modern outlook. This is not merely the aim of Modernism, but of all thinking men of every school. If we are to present the gospel to our own generation we must do so in terms which it can understand and appeal to thoughts and convictions which it possesses. Every generation has been engaged on such a synthesis, even the second generation of Christians, even St. Paul himself; only to-day our conditions and our world view are our own. We have to reckon with an outlook created by modern science and modern psychology.

This problem will not be solved merely by a revival. In spite of the revivals of the past, competent and sympathetic observers detect a steady and gradual decay of religious influence in European civilization, and these revivals have not been able to check, or at least to stop, the decline. And the reason (one reason at least) is, according to Dr. W. R. MATTHEWS, that both the Evangelical and the Catholic revivals stood apart from the general advance of the human mind. We are told that there are signs of a new revival of religion. Let us hope that this is a true prophecy. But of one thing we may be sure, that it will not come until some sort of understanding has been arrived at with the modern mind. The old revivals arose in the lives of men sure of the basis of their faith in an infallible Bible. That basis has been shattered, and a revival can only come to us if and when we attain a similar certainty on a different basis. A revival cannot come to people who are disturbed and uncertain and vague about the fundamental facts of faith. Here is an additional reason for the necessity of the synthesis already referred to.

Dr. MATTHEWS, who possesses one of the acutest minds in the Church of England, faced this problem at the recent Birmingham Conference of the Modern Churchmen, and his essay is published in the current number of *The Modern Churchman*. Most of his paper is occupied with an analysis of the two terms in the suggested synthesis, Christianity and the modern outlook. What is Christianity? That would seem an easy question to answer, but, as he points out, there are two views of it. One is that of the Liberal Protestant who says that Christianity is the faith of Jesus, consisting of two master thoughts, the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man. Dr. MATTHEWS rejects this view on the obvious ground that Christianity from the earliest days has been not the faith of Jesus, but a faith *in* Jesus.

The second view is that Christianity is an experience which he describes as consisting of four things. It is (1) an ethical monotheism, a faith in God, the Supreme Value and the Sustainer of all true values. (2) Its salient peculiarity is that it has found God in Christ, who claims not only our loyalty but our worship. (3) It is a religion of redemption. This is the secret of its continual influence on the world and on the life of man. And (4) it is a fellowship. It is deeply hostile to the idea that the life of the spirit is one of solitude. A Christian outside the Church is an anomaly. A Christian who does not feel his need of the Church is an anomaly.

But we must relate this experience to all that we otherwise believe to be true. We must harmonize our Christian experience with the knowledge of Reality that comes to us from modern knowledge. And so we turn to the modern outlook. The modern world has been made by science, and what dominates us to-day and creates our atmosphere is the scientific method which is inductive, a reasoning from observed facts to conclusions.

There are three characteristics of the modern view created by this inductive method. One is its attitude to authority. It will not bow to authority in the older sense. The only authority it recognizes is that of fact and experience. And so we cannot come to the modern mind with an infallible authority *ab extra*. But, when we base our appeal on the facts of experience and on the massive and persistent phenomena of religious life, we present a challenge which the modern mind has to face.

Further, the modern mind does not regard with favour fixed and comprehensive views of the universe. And thus it finds no attraction in a theology which forms a closed and completed system. It can understand an attitude that confesses ignorance, and, basing itself on experience, advances slowly to an ever deeper insight. Modernist theologians are often accused of vagueness, but no answer is better than a wrong answer, and a vague suggestion is often more spiritually fruitful than a dogmatic assertion which closes the avenue to truth.

The third characteristic of the modern outlook is its acceptance of the principle of continuity. The evolutionary conception of the world is one application of this principle. And here one sees the signs of a religious synthesis in the gradual approach of an interpretation of evolution which regards it as creative and teleological. This bids fair to deepen and purify our conception of God and of His relation to the world.

Dr. MATTHEWS does not devote much space to the task of relating these two terms, but what he says is suggestive. He finds that in all its four 'moments' the conception of Christianity will be affected. Evolution will, as indicated, enrich our faith in God, though much obsolete metaphysics will have to be given up. Redemption, again, will have to be approached and interpreted afresh by the avenue of psychology. The Christian fellowship has to be related to the modern social consciousness. But of one thing we may be sure. We do not want a new religion. We believe in the finality of the Christian gospel. Yet this message has to be related continuously to the whole mind of men. This synthesis will not be easily made. Nor will it ever be complete. And what we have to do is to preach the gospel (which is *the* answer to the problem of this enigmatic world) as something not aloof and incomprehensible, but as growing out

of the life and thought of our day as their completion and their crown.

Not even Dr. Gerald H. Rendall, with all the will in the world, can throw light on Ja 3^6, a standing crux of commentators. In the Revised Version the verse reads: 'And the tongue is a fire: the world of iniquity among our members is the tongue, which defileth the whole body, and setteth on fire the wheel of nature, and is set on fire by hell.' The last clause (φλογιζομένη ὑπο τῆς γεέννης) has probably for its background in the mind of the writer the actual figure of burning in the valley of Hinnom. Yet, as Dr. Rendall remarks in his work on *The Epistle of St. James and Judaic Christianity* (reviewed in another column), the association of Gehenna with the tongue seems strange and unnatural.

The meaning of the penultimate clause is still more obscure (φλογίζουσα τὸν τροχὸν τῆς γενέσεως) 'Setting on fire the wheel of nature (R.V.), the course of nature (A.V.), the round circle of existence (Moffatt)'—what does it mean? In favour of the rendering, 'the round circle of existence,' partial parallels may be cited from Orphic or Neo-Platonic or Pythagorean language, but these throw no real light on the difficulty. Nor do the wheels in Ezekiel's vision help us, nor the idea of cycles of metempsychosis, nor the fact of the ignition of chariot wheels by friction with the axle.

Dr. Rendall has searched in vain for clues from medical or mystical or metaphysical diction (Aristotelian, Platonic, or Neo-Platonic), and he thinks it would be hard to improve on A.V. 'course of nature,' whatever that—as he adds—may mean.

'More or less as a counsel of despair,' he says, 'I suggest that ὀπόν for τροχόν would carry out the opening metaphor and give coherence to the whole. The word is not Biblical, but is used metaphorically of the sap and vigour, the vital forces, for example of youth (ἥβης); the meaning would then be that the tongue, like a fire igniting a mass of wood, sets on fire and burns up all the vital juices that contribute to the making of man, and along the charred embers play the flickering flames of Gehenna.'

What may be urged in favour of such a rendering? It preserves for γένεσις that sensé of man's natural and spiritual growth which it has in 1^{23} (R.V., 'beholding his natural face in a mirror'), besides continuing the previous figure; and it gives intelligible expression to the sense imputed to ὁ τροχός as 'the impelling power of human nature and life.'

And what may be urged against it? A corrupt text is presupposed. The emendation consists in the substitution for ὁ τροχός of an unusual word. If the unfamiliar ὀπόν were misread as ὄχον, why should it not have remained at that? Further, do not 'the flickering flames of Gehenna' play upon the tongue itself, and not upon the 'charred embers' of the body?

Montanism.

LIVING ISSUES FOR TO-DAY.

By Professor W. D. Niven, M.A., United Free Church College, Glasgow.

This is a discussion of Montanism, not a history. The mere history is exceedingly obscure. More interesting and important is it in any case to try to estimate Montanism from the *terminus ad quem* than painfully to trace it out from the *terminus a quo*; to get the logic of it rather than the chronology; to grasp the real significance of it which only Time made clear, rather than to record the swaying to and fro of opinions regarding it from the second to the fourth century.

55566

Ere she had completed two centuries of existence, the Church became involved in five great conflicts, not to mention several smaller. From all she emerged in a real enough sense victorious. Each of them, however, modified her to some degree, and all of them together contributed largely to making her institutionally and constitutionally the definite historical entity that she became. Further, in none was her victory so complete that all the points in dispute were settled. Each left unsolved at least one big question or group of questions which more or less, now in one form now in another, has engaged her mind ever since, still awaits solution, and still divides Christian opinion.

Thus the conflict with *Judaism* left doubtful and disputable the abiding validity of parts of the ancient Law; that with *Paganism* the question as to how other religions are to be regarded; that with *the Empire* the thorny problem of Church and State; that with *Gnosticism* a whole series of difficulties—Reason *v.* Revelation, Philosophy *v.* Theology, the concept of Revelation, the meaning and efficacy of the Sacraments, the value of the O.T., etc.; that with *Montanism* the abiding puzzle of the relation of the Church and the Christian to the world.

Montanism, with which we are now concerned, is unique among the five in being a purely internal controversy. In all the others, even in Gnosticism, the Church was faced with something external to herself. Montanism was a *schism*.

The history of Montanism is not yet finished. As we shall see, we may doubt the probability that it will ever finish. Ancient Montanism, itself, had a long history and underwent notable development. Hence it resulted that when Christianity was on the point of being adopted as the official Religion of the Empire, there were in Christendom two Churches, and the efforts of Constantine to procure unity were not completely successful. The notion that anciently there was one Church embracing all Christians in a real, if not yet definitely formal, unity is quite a mistake. 'The ancient Church, one and undivided,' is only a pious fiction.[1]

Montanism disappeared from notice, partly because the Arian Controversy absorbed the whole strength of the Church and diverted the Christian mind from the problem, but chiefly because the adoption of Monasticism as an integral feature of the Church's institutions afforded a practical way out of the main Montanistic difficulty. As soon as the Reformation abolished Monasticism, the old problem inevitably re-emerged among Protestants.

[1] *Vide* Harnack, *D.G.* p. 99.

From being something that strikes us, as it did many at the time, as mere arbitrariness, eccentricity, and fanaticism—an Inspirationism and an Adventism—Montanism soon became something important, raising questions which to this day produce friction and schism.

As the conflict between it and the Church proceeded, Montanism got rid of most of its extravagances, and became aware of its real strength. On the other hand, the Church in the process of controversy became greatly transformed. It was against Montanism that the first Synods, precursors of Councils, were called. Montanus first imposed regular contributions on his followers, instituted Collectors, and paid his 'Clergy' a salary. He was the first, we may say, to conceive of a Central Fund. As results of the conflict, the monarchial Episcopate and the hierarchal constitution of the Church were firmly established; the authority of Scripture as in a real sense closing Revelation was asserted; a system governing the discipline and restoration of sinning Church-members was evolved; the idea of all the Churches forming a unity—'one Holy Catholic Church'—was grasped; the supremacy of the Roman See was distinctly foreshadowed; and, most far-reaching in its effect, a clear distinction was drawn between Clergy and Laity. The very concept of the Church, Harnack says, was *total geändert*.

This phrase of Harnack's, however, needs to be safeguarded, otherwise it may convey a quite misleading impression. The concept of the Church was 'totally changed,' not in the sense that for one definite view which had prevailed up to that point a new and quite distinct one was substituted; but much rather in the way in which the egg is 'totally changed' into the bird. Out of vague, unformed, indefinite thoughts as to the nature, function, and constitution of the Church, a clear-cut and imposing conception emerged. The Montanistic controversy contributed very powerfully towards this differentiation, but it cannot be claimed that it was the sole factor.

Montanus, we may suppose, set out from the two Scripture topics on one or other, or both, of which a great many species of abnormal Christianity have taken their stand and still do so, viz. the Paraclete and the Second Advent.

Montanus held that the Paraclete would be manifested in definite individuals, and he was convinced that he and his two associated prophetesses stood in an unbroken succession that fulfilled our Lord's prediction. The three of them were the Divinely appointed completers of Revelation. In

some such view he has had many successors. One may think of Mohammed, Swedenborg, Joseph Smith, or Mrs. Eddy. For Montanus it followed clearly that not the Bishops but the 'prophets' must be the real rulers of the Church.[1]

And how did the Spirit manifest Himself? What made Montanus and his associates prophets? The Spirit did not just illumine their minds and clarify their judgments. He reduced them to a state of passivity. They had no control of the words they uttered; they uttered truths that they themselves could not have known. They were the lyres from which the hand of the Spirit drew forth music. In ecstasy they uttered their truth. In dream and vision the Spirit spoke to them. They found revived in their own experience the charismatic gifts described in the New Testament.

Now this business of what I call Inspirationism, with ecstasy and other physical manifestations, found in Montanism and again and again all down the centuries to the revivals of recent times, is wrapped in difficulty. It raises the same kind of perplexity as Spiritualism. When Montanus said, 'I am the Father and the Son and the Paraclete,'[2] he had manifestly crossed the line which separates fervour from extravagance. When one prophetess in her ecstasy declared that Christ in the form of a woman slept with her,[3] she was on the verge of repulsive eroticism—indeed, the saving clause 'in form of a woman' looks suspiciously like a mere concession to public opinion. In face of such a saying many must have been inclined to take the oath which Tennyson puts into the mouth of Sir Gawain—to be

> deafer than the blue-eyed cat,
> And thrice as blind as any noonday owl,
> To holy virgins in their ecstasies ('Holy Grail').

Although Montanism was known in the ancient world as the 'New Prophecy,' 'oracular prophetism' soon ceased to be its characteristic feature. It was not so much perhaps the criticism of its opponents, formidable as that was, as the criticism of Time to which Montanism yielded. For Time declared against the truth of the great message that Montanus proclaimed. What was it? What but the message that 'prophets' in nearly all the centuries have announced—'the end of all things is at hand.' According to Montanus, Christ was about to descend at a Phrygian city, and all the faithful were summoned to assemble there to abide His coming.

Once again, let us be as sympathetic as we can. No passages in Scripture are so obscure as those which seem to deal with the End. Such is the difficulty that it may be said that normal Christianity has tacitly abandoned the attempt to interpret them, and towards the Second Coming is content to take an attitude of agnosticism. Montanus was no more astray than a multitude since his time, and even of the present day, who have failed to take warning from his example. The idea that Christ should make a Highland town in Phrygia His headquarters, to which all His true followers should be gathered, is not essentially more absurd than the idea which even some ministers cherish to-day that in their lifetime they will be mysteriously transported to Jerusalem. It is one of the strangest phenomena of the human mind that despite so many disillusionments wrought by Time, with invincible optimism and unshakable assurance some will still go on calculating 'the times and seasons,' and come to the conclusion that Christ is visibly to descend in their own days.

Noteworthy is it that although ancient Montanism may be said to have abandoned its inspirationism and its adventism, both those elements have tended to appear in connexion with many modern movements that are comparable more or less with Montanism. Many ultra-evangelicals have laid great stress upon manifestations of the Spirit, and devoted very close attention to some doctrine of the Parousia. It is a criticism passed on the Church by Darbyites that we have given up preaching the Second Coming. Even inspirationism lingers on in attenuated form in many quarters inside as well as outside the Church. Something like Montanus's idea that man is the passive instrument, the Spirit the player, lies behind the popular repugnance to written sermons and the still stronger suspicion of written or printed prayers.

In Montanistic prophetism, however, there lay a more important and respectable element, the view, namely, that the real leader of a Christian community should be not a man appointed 'officially,' but a man 'raised up' by the Holy Spirit. Montanism never surrendered this view which was widely held indeed by primitive Christianity. That a leader had authority not in virtue of an office to which he was ordained, but in virtue of his possession of the Spirit, became a watchword of Montanism. At first this did not

[1] Doubtless this 'degrading' of Bishops explains the extraordinary virulence of the Catholic attack upon Montanism and the ludicrous inadequacy of Eusebius' account of it.

[2] Euseb., *H.E.* bk. v.

[3] Epiphanius, *Haer.* xlix. 1.

constitute a real breach with the Church, whose views were still fluid in Montanus's time. A very rapid high-Church development, however, took place within the next half-century. Circumstances, it may successfully be urged, compelled it. More and more it became necessary for 'officials' to regulate all the complicated business of the Church, and for the ministry to be put under strict guidance and specially trained and officially examined as to their fitness for their work. The Church's answer to the Montanistic pretension to 'charismatic spontaneity' as over against 'officialism' was quite convincing. It was that Montanism itself had a 'professionalism,' and that there was no evidence that its 'prophets' were truly endowed with the Holy Spirit. Its 'prophetic' succession, supposed to be guaranteed by the possession of the Spirit, was not so demonstrably in the Apostolic line as the official succession guaranteed by ordination. Curious charges could be made against the quality of some of the prophets. 'Tell me,' cries Apollonius, 'does a prophet dye his hair? Does a prophet stain his eyebrows? Does a prophet delight in ornament? Does a prophet play with tablets and dice? Does he take usury? Let them acknowledge whether these things be right or not, and I will show that they have been done by them.'[1]

Modern Montanists, too, protest against a professional, 'man-made' ministry. Some of their leaders have been known to thank God that they were never at a College. We note this view, we need not here discuss it.

Inspirationism and Adventism might go, they had to go, but the really vital point in Montanism now emerges. In order to meet Christ, Montanus held that in a very literal sense Christians should leave the world. The world was doomed, and the Faithful should leave it, and also come out of a Church that was becoming worldly. They must greatly raise the standard of their unworldliness. Their lives must be much more austere, much more simple and holy. Fasts must be multiplied. Let us have three Lents in the year instead of one, and two weeks of abstinence, and let them be strictly observed. If marriages cannot be dissolved, let no one marry twice, and let virginity be specially honoured. Let all practise self-denial. Let persecution and martyrdom be not shunned but welcomed.

Here is where Montanism was really strong. Here is where the Church had to join main issue with it. Here is where we ourselves have to take account of it. At this point there emerged a question between the Church and Montanism which has never been settled, both sides of which still claim their adherents.

The Church and Montanism here took sharply opposed views and each could appeal to Scripture. Nay, it was but a new form of a much older question. The contrast appears in the Old Testament. On the one side we have *universalism*, on the other *exclusiveness* with the ideas of a 'chosen people' and even within that 'a remnant'—*ecclesiola in ecclesia*. Big Church or Little Church? As between Montanism and Catholicism the cleft has been explored as far as any human abilities can reach, and no bottom has ever been found.

To the Montanist the world was hopeless, doomed, perishing, and the very enemy of the Kingdom. To the Catholic the world was destined to be saved, so that all its kingdoms should become the Kingdom of our Lord. To the Montanist the world was a sphere of temptation, to the Catholic it was a field of opportunity. To the Montanist the world was to be fled from, to the Catholic it was to be conquered and transformed, Christians being not the jewels but the salt of the Earth.

Their respective views of the nature of the Church were inevitably just as divergent. To the Montanist the Church was God's vineyard to be purged of every weed, to the Catholic it was the drag-net in which admixture of good and bad was to be expected. The Parable of the Wheat and the Tares expressly warned the Church against any such scheme of drastic purging as Montanists proposed. The Church was not meant to be holy in the sense that every individual member should be holy before he was admitted, but in the sense that she was a school of holiness within which all should be instructed in and helped towards holiness,[2] outside which none could be saved.

The issue is fundamental, important, and still living. There can be no question that this came to be the real point of the Montanistic controversy. Not by its charismatic ministry, not by its Phrygian Adventism, but by its *puritanism* did Montanism win adherents far and wide,[3] awake sympathy in distant Gaul, enlist in its service the great Tertullian, and bring a Bishop of Rome to the point of almost blessing it.

In the main we can agree, I suppose, that the Catholic Church was right both in her view of the world and in her conception of the Church. Mon-

[1] Didymus, *Alex. de Trin.*, iii. 41.

[2] Cf. Harnack, *D.G.* p. 104. The Church was 'Societas fidei non fidelium.'

[3] Cf. *D.G.* p. 102.

tanism was not only impolitic but unwarranted and impracticable.

If the Church had no great difficulty in convicting Montanism of fanaticism, yet the issue raised by Montanism put the Church in a dilemma. Many doubtless felt that while Montanism might put things crudely and extravagantly, yet it expressed what they themselves had been thinking. There was something which could not be set aside in this call to greater purity of the Church's communion rolls, and in the call to flee the temptations of the world and lead a life of self-denial. To many, no doubt, there seemed a good deal of risk that the world was transforming the Church more than she was transforming the world. Earnest men could not forget that over against the Parable of the Drag-net had to be considered passages which proclaimed the duty of separation from the world. Big Church or Little Church? There were passages which seemed to favour the idea of the latter. The mere fact that a Church is growing big and powerful gives rise to misgiving in a certain type of mind. A small body in constant protest against things in general is the ideal that some cherish of the Church to-day. It is largely this suspicion of a big Church which constitutes one source of doubt in some minds at present, as to the desirability of Reunion of the Churches. In the early days the winning of representatives of the cultured and powerful classes to the Faith probably raised some difficulties for not a few. Had not St. Paul declared that not many noble, not many wise, were called? It was all very well to be reminded of how Israel had spoiled the Egyptians, but this bringing of Greek culture and philosophy into the Church, had it not its dangers? What had Christ to do with Plato? what Jerusalem with the Academy? What had the Christian to do with Homer, that text-book of Heathenism? Still deeper anxiety must have been occasioned to many by the tendency, which gained strength as time went on, for Church members to attend the Theatre and the Circus. The idolatry associated with these things, formal as it might be, was dangerous; and inconsistent with a profession of Christianity was the worldliness of the mind which could find any pleasure in such waste of time.

Now we all probably feel that this view of life is very easy to criticise. Whether it be Tertullian who storms in his antiquely flavoured Latin from Carthage, or the modern street-preacher in his semi-scriptural English who denounces the theatre, our first feeling is one of pity for such fanaticism, but our second is one of uneasiness that they are saying something that needs attention and raises a question. Beyond all doubt Christians ought to be unworldly, and the Church ought to be unworldly, and we must all have had an uncomfortable feeling at times that the boundaries between the spiritual and the worldly in our own lives are far from clear; that in opening our Church halls for dances and whist-drives we have perhaps surrendered too much; that the much-belauded policy of the modern Church catering for all human activities, amusements included, has perhaps been carried too far. It is a very real question which each must answer as best he may, *what is* that *world* from which the Christian should be *separate*?

It is easy to answer the question by a phrase and say that while we are to be *in* the world we are not to be *of* it. But what precisely in definite cases does this mean?

I am not a Montanist nor in general a lover of Montanists, but I confess to a good deal of sympathy with their view that the best way to show that one is not of the world is at certain points not to be in it. What these particular points may be, it must be left for each to discover for himself. Where Montanists, ancient and modern, go astray is in attempting to draw lines for all. That has always resulted in arbitrariness, irrationality, and fanaticism. One may be sure, however, that in the modern world, with its glaring contrast between ostentatious luxury and semi-destitution or almost complete destitution, a contrast which more than anything else fosters Bolshevism and makes many quite decent men 'see red'—it is the duty of the Church to preach, and of the Christian to practise, the simple life.

But to return to the ancient world. In face of Montanistic puritanism, as I have said, the Church felt herself in a dilemma. Montanism as expounded, say, by Tertullian might be fanatical or at least extravagant. On the other hand, it could not be denied that much could be urged in favour of inculcating a life simple to the point of austerity, a life of virginal purity, of self-sacrifice and self-denial. How did the Church propose to do justice both to those who demanded not unreasonably that all innocent life should be open to them, that Greek culture was their birthright, and that they had a right to Christian joyousness and geniality, and to those who felt themselves summoned to flee the world with its pomps and shows, and tread the hard path of austerity?

Her solution was to recognize a twofold morality,[1] one, the easier, for the laity; the other, the higher,

[1] Cf. Harnack, *D.G.* p. 100.

the more exigent, the more arduous for the clergy.[1] In consequence, clergy and laity now became sharply distinguished in a new way. The distinction, in so far as it had existed hitherto, had been one mainly of *function*. Henceforth it becomes ever more clearly one of *caste*. The laity were to be in the world striving to be not of it. The clergy as far as possible were not to be in it. Clergy and laity are under different laws. Their spheres of duty are different, and as result, their privileges. Of this distinction it may with truth be said that it was one of the most momentous and most mischievous that the Church ever drew. From it in due course followed most of the evils which made the Reformation necessary. Against a heavy load of demerit cannot be set even the solitary merit that it solved the problem it was designed to meet. It did not. Obviously it could not. As hinted already, the real solution for the ancient and mediæval Church came with the institution of Monasticism.

But this distinction of clergy and laity with a higher, stricter law for the clergy, persisted, and the Reformation was powerless greatly to affect it. The notion that ministers ought to be more pious, more austere, more given to self-denial than the ordinary member, more or less persists still. It is not merely the reasonable demand that in all things the minister must show a good example. It is an insistence that there are certain things which the ordinary member may do, but which the minister must not, or at least should not, do. In the popular mind, indeed, in the Presbyterian Church there are three grades of life, one for the member, one for the elder, and one for the minister. The knowledge that it is so is in many cases the real reason for the reluctance of men to accept office as elders; and it is in vain that one urges that what is wrong for an elder is wrong for a member, that a man unfit morally or spiritually to be an elder is unfit to be a member. So it was in vain that the Reformation declared the equality of all Christian men in privilege and obligation. In vain did some Churches lower the conception of minister to that of 'teaching elder.' Precisely in some such communions was the notion most firmly held that the minister must not engage in some things in which the ordinary member might. That certain things were 'inconsistent with the dignity of the ministerial calling' was the new ground on which the distinction was based. At bottom, however, it was just the old distinction of one law for the laity and a stricter law for the clergy. So strong and persistent is this distinction rooted as it is in the common mind, that ministers, protest as they may against the irrationality of it, must, if they are wise, lay their accounts with it. Ministers have to ask not only can I do this as a Christian? but can I do this as a Christian minister?

To-day ministers are permitted a much wider liberty than they used to have, but this liberty is a thing that they will be cautious in vindicating. Plainly the popular distinction between clergy and laity is irrational, but, in a world not yet completely rationalized, considerations of prudence and expediency will prevent us rejecting or ignoring a thing just because it is irrational. 'All things are lawful for me, but all are not expedient. All things are lawful for me, but all things edify not.' We need not believe that ministers are under a higher law than the laity. We need not be greatly interested in 'keeping up the dignity of the ministerial calling,' whatever that may mean. We need, however, to be greatly concerned about the influence we exert. As far as my experience goes, the least influential in any important direction is the type of minister regarding whom his congregation are ready to rise and sing as soon as he appears —'For he's a jolly good fellow.' It is possible, we may observe, for a minister to be so 'human' as to have little influence in making others divine.

One other topic needs attention. The attempted reunion of ancient Montanism with the Church did not succeed. A new cause of division emerged, as I have indicated, in the sphere of discipline.

The general question, however, raised by Montanism is one that confronts us as it did the Ancient Church. It is one of the chief criticisms of the Churches passed by modern Montanists that discipline is not nearly strict enough, that the Church is far too lax in scrutinizing the lives of her members, and admits persons to membership and the highest privileges on far too easy terms. Once again, we have the uneasy feeling, as the ancient Church had, that while Montanists may make impossible demands which would decimate the membership of the Church without really securing the purity desiderated, there is, notwithstanding, a good deal in what they reproach us with. Many of us feel that nothing is so unsatisfactory about our present-day Presbyterian Church as its system of Discipline, if indeed it can be said to have one at all. On what terms does our Church in practice to-day admit catechumens to full membership? *No one can tell.* In practice Sessions admit those whom the Minister recommends, but none but himself can tell why he recommends them, what standard he

[1] The two distinctions were not *absolutely* co-extensive, but in the main.

has required, or what attempt he has made to discover their spiritual state. It is quite certain that different ministers have different standards, even in the *way* in which new communicants are admitted. Some require some form of public profession of faith, some require none. The whole business is in a state of chaos. Some think that what we need is not primarily a new Creed—although we do need that badly—but a Directory imposed with official sanction as the mind of the Church, regulating the admission of new members, and making some real attempt to deal with lapses of all members from the standard of Christian morality. How the second point might be carried out it is difficult to see. Discipline is bound to be shadowy without either some kind of *Confession* as Luther retained it, or some kind of *inquisition* as Calvin instituted. Experience has shown the one to be somewhat dangerous, and the other to be sheerly intolerable. Our Church, however, should give its mind to the problem of Discipline. Church membership ought to connote some high standard of character and life. In our present state of individualistic arbitrariness no one can tell what it connotes. Not only Montanists but ancient Catholics would exclaim in horror, 'Brethren, such things ought not so to be.'

Thus it is plain that Montanism and the answer of the Ancient Church alike raise living, most important, questions for ourselves. Montanism is not a page of ancient history. It is a living issue on which all Christians must take some position. It was the first occasion of a serious breach of Christian unity. To the end it is likely to prove the main obstacle in the way of complete reunion. That is almost inevitable since the contrast, which divides Big Church from Little Church, lies in Scripture itself, in the recorded words of Christ and the writings of Apostles. Big Church and Little Church alike are each of them based on a Scriptural foundation. The contrast can neither be ignored nor overcome. There will always be divergent views as to what is that world which we are meant to take over, and, transforming it, make it Christian, and that world from which, to save our souls, we must flee. For myself I claim my membership in the Big Church, and my right to a big world. But I am so far from deploring the existence of the Little Church that I think something very useful would be lost did it disappear. There are human beings whose souls can be saved only in the Little Church for whom the monastic or ascetic or austere life is an ark of salvation.

I do not accept Kant's view that only that is good which we can conceive all men doing. Although we need not and cannot all be ascetics fleeing from the world, it is good for some that they should be and do so. It is best for them, and that they do so is good for all of us. It is all for the good of the Big Church that on its skirts there should be the Little Church, keenly watchful, critical, and protesting; making even extravagant demands for high-toned life; striving after unattainable things like perfection and complete purity of Church membership and Church aims; and by its unpractical other-worldliness reminding us that worldliness is a strong and subtle force against which unceasing vigilance is required.

The Little Church has its own faults, curiously the same to-day as we discern in Tertullian—blemishes such as self-centredness, spiritual arrogance, and lack of charity; and a tendency to a kind of legalism which represents as 'sinful' what the normal human mind will never find sinful at all. Despite all that, I am disposed to take towards modern Montanism the attitude which that Bishop of Rome took towards the ancient; I just hesitate to give it my blessing.

Literature.

THE MANY-SIDED MASTER.

THE Master is an inexhaustible subject. From time to time we have some big study of Him and His ministry as a whole. And between times there come detailed studies from one angle or another, looking at His relation to some form of human experience or some large human interest. The big studies have not been wanting recently, and here are two of those delightful lesser visions in two of the newer books—*Jesus the Citizen*, by Professor J. A. Robertson, D.D., of Aberdeen United Free Church College, and *Jesus and Art* ('Living Church' series), by the Rev. J. Robertson Cameron, D.Phil., author of 'The Renascence of Jesus' (both published by James Clarke & Co.; the former 5s. net, and the latter 6s. net).

Professor Robertson is a well-equipped New Testament scholar. But his special characteristic is that he combines with sound knowledge the vision of the poet. This mixture of the poet with the scholar has its advantages. It gives to all the Professor's books a quality of imaginative construction that is very attractive. He sees things as they must have been, and as you read you cannot help feeling, 'Yes, that is what must have happened.' This new book is full of such reconstructions. When Dr. Robertson speaks of 'Jesus the Citizen' he is not dealing with economics or with the relation of Jesus to social problems. He uses 'citizen' in its literal sense of an inhabitant of cities, and he sets out to make one aspect of the career of our Lord—His contact with cities, Nazareth, Capernaum, Jerusalem—stand out for the reader more clearly than before. It need hardly be said that with his scholar's equipment and his poet's vision he succeeds in his aim. The whole book is a delightful series of pictures of Jesus as He moved from city to city, of what He found in each and of what each found, or failed to find, in Him.

It is true that the poet in this scholar sometimes gets out of hand. Professor Robertson often makes much out of little, but he sometimes makes a good deal out of nothing! It is not really an attractive picture he draws of 'the sensitive boy standing with beating heart at the door of the humble home [in Nazareth] and peering out, and listening, with every nerve astrain, to the weird, long-drawn wail of the hyenas, and to the answering howl of pariah dogs, and the moan of the owls in the outer darkness beyond the city walls—listening and turning back with a shudder into the lighted house.' One feels that this is all wrong. Jesus was never a neurotic youth. Similar instances occur from time to time of what is really a defect of the author's quality. On the other hand, the book is full of good things. What could be better than this? 'Nazareth was the cradle of Christ, but Capernaum was the cradle of Christianity.' Many people will enjoy Dr. Robertson's vivid pictures, and none the less because there is a good deal of excellent preaching in them.

Dr. Robertson Cameron is known as an enthusiastic student of art, and as no mean authority on it. He has put not only his very competent mind but his flaming heart into this book. We should say that if anything he ever wrote carried his deepest thought and enthusiasm this book on *Jesus and Art* does it. To him art is not an amusement, as it is to many, or even a recreation, but a necessity and a religion. Art springs from the same depths in the soul as religion. These are twain as witnesses to the one supreme Reality that reveals itself as Truth and Beauty, and so God is revealed not only by science and by thought and by action, but by art. Dr. Cameron says with definite conviction that we shall never really understand Christ adequately without the illumination of the arts. And he shows how the great masters—Leonardo, Beethoven, Rembrandt—have all sat at the feet of Christ and got their inspiration from Him. These are the main thoughts that drive their way in this living and illuminating book. A book is always worth while into which a man has put his very self. It has a message because it is an embodiment of a vision. And, without exaggeration, all this can be said of Dr. Cameron's *Jesus and Art*. What art is, what Christ has done for it, what it has done for Christ and what, still more, it can do for Christ—these are the thoughts that burn in the glowing pages of this book. It is a real book, full not only of enthusiasm but of clear thinking and of knowledge and instruction.

THE SACRAMENTS.

The Christian Sacraments (Nisbet; 10s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Oliver C. Quick, M.A., Canon of Carlisle Cathedral, is a new volume of the publishers' series, 'The Library of Constructive Theology.' The aim of the series is to produce constructive studies in Christianity having religious experience for their starting-point, and which will be at once intelligible to the general reader and worthy of the attention of the specialist.

Canon Quick's method of approach to sacramental theory is not so much by the avenue of the historical (he does not ask his readers to breathe an 'antiquarian atmosphere') as through philosophy and general experience. Beginning with an exposition of the two general relations between the inward and the outward in the sacramentally ordered universe, namely, instrumentality and significance or expressiveness, he is led to affirm the life of Christ as the supreme sacrament, as being both the supreme instrument of God in the fulfilment of His purposes and the supreme expression of God within the created world. Christ the supreme instrument of God—that is the Atonement; Christ the supreme expression of God—that is the Incarnation. 'Just as the sacramental meaning of the Incarnation is to present Christ's life as the full expression of the Divine goodness in the world of

space and time, so the Atonement on the Cross concentrates at a point the instrumental operation of the Divine power whereby alone all things can be made to contribute to the final good.'

So far the argument moves in the general sphere of theistic and Christian philosophy. Coming to the Christian Sacraments, which he regards as extensions both of the Incarnation and of the Atonement, the author proceeds to describe the Church as the sacrament of human society, Baptism as the sacrament of man's spiritual birth to God, Holy Communion as the sacrament of human fellowship in Him, holy days as sacraments of time, and holy places as sacraments of space. Underlying his conception of the nature of sacraments there is always the principle of severance and differentiation, whereby the sacrament both represents, expresses, or symbolizes the true relation of the whole to God and is the means or instrument whereby this relation is more effectively realized.

The line of thought which is followed leads to a view of the sacraments clearly distinguishable alike from the 'magical' (as Bishop Barnes has been expressing it) and from the merely pictorial or dramatic. It leads also to open-mindedness on the historical problems, so much discussed at present, connected with the institution of the sacraments. Speaking of the Eucharist, Canon Quick says very wisely: 'It may well be that the more courageously we rest the authority of that Sacrament, not on the events of the Last Supper alone, but on the meaning of Christ's sacrifice of Himself interpreted in the faith of Christendom, the more convincingly probable it will appear that the bread was indeed then broken and the wine poured out with a deeper significance than any which even orthodoxy itself has so far succeeded in expressing.'

Enough has been said to indicate the plan and contents of this work, which we commend for its ability, thoughtfulness, timeliness, and moderation.

THE ENGLISH HYMN.

In the marvellous shrine at Edinburgh Castle there is carved in bronze a very long and almost weirdly lifelike procession of all those who gave themselves for us during the War. On and on they stream, men and women of all ranks and types, until one's heart grows chokingly full and very humble. Mr. Frederick John Gillman has set before us in *The Evolution of the English Hymn* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net) with almost equal lifelikeness the long line of the singers of Christ's Church as that has wound its way down through the centuries. Dr. Walford Davies assures us we could have no better guide. And, indeed, he writes a fascinating study full of knowledge and enthusiasm, and with a certain likeableness about the man himself finding its way into every page. Percy of the *Reliques* declared that it is in its songs you find the real heart of a nation. That is true. And studying its praise from age to age, one has one's fingers on the pulse through which the Church's life-blood has kept beating, now languidly, now strong and fast.

We begin with the first happy days when all Christian hearts were singing. And then there comes the shadow of discussion and dispute. 'As it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be,' was at first flung defiantly into the face of Arius. For those were strange days when, as Gregory of Nazianzus complained, 'every corner and nook of the city is full of men who discuss incomprehensible subjects,' so that if you asked, Is my bath ready? you were answered, Yes, yes, but 'the Son of God was created from nothing.' Our journey takes us far. Here we pause for a little with Synesius and hear the very throb of the man's heart, the thrill of his joys and the ache of his sorrows; and here with the great Ambrose, reading the hymns that steadied Augustine. Now we are among the Crusaders as they ride shouting their favourite by Fortunatus. And now the way takes us by little Clairvaux, and by mighty Cluny and by Assisi. Women's voices at times carry to us. It was not Bernard but a certain Abbess who wrote, 'But what to those who find? Ah! this nor tongue nor pen can show.' And it was Héloïse who inspired the hymns of Abelard as well as the hot poems of his youth. And so at last, meandering through pleasant chapters upon charms, and the carols in the Nativity Plays and such-like, we find ourselves in Britain—St. Patrick, St. Columba, Caedmon, and so on, but for long with not very much to make us pause; 'for the congregational hymn as we know it to-day is a direct result of the Reformation,' and we owe it not to Luther only, but to Calvin also. He felt that Church praise should be founded purely upon Scripture; and for one hundred and fifty years in England no less than Scotland it was Metrical Psalms alone they sang. Elizabeth might term them 'Geneva Jigs,' but London went wild over them. Many tried their hands at it, Milton of course, and, less well known, a beautiful version of Ps 130 by Phineas Fletcher. Luther, as everybody knows, believed in hymns; and, from the day that the martyrdom by fire of two lads in Brussels set

him singing, his sacred songs ran everywhere; for, as Dr. Walford Davies puts it, 'Christianity marches to music'; and Mr. Gillman ranks the hymns next to the Bible as the most effective weapon in the whole armoury of the Church. Wither among our own devotional poets is given the credit of being the first to see 'what are the essential requirements of a good hymn.' And so we pass on by the Herbert group, by Donne having his wild soul quieted by listening to his own exquisite Hymn to God the Father sung in St. Paul's; by Ken writing his famous morning and evening hymns for the boys of Winchester School, to an interesting study of the Quaker position. The General Baptists too would for long allow no congregational praise. On the other hand, Barclay declared 'it was not unusual' for the Quakers to have singing. That died out of course, and yet, so we are told, one-tenth of the hymns in the collections of the Churches are from the pens of Quakers. The great figure of Watts, the man who said that Christ must be the Central Figure in our Christian praise, and who began to write because his father, complaining of the rubbish to which he had just listened, challenged him to do better. The Wesleys too, with John as the real originator of the hymns, though Charles poured out six thousand. Byrom, whose famous 'Christians, Awake' was a Christmas gift to his daughter Dolly; Cowper and Newton, who wrote for a small country congregation; Heber, 'the father of the literary hymn'; the Oxford Movement, which Pusey declared really owed everything to Keble's hymns; and so down to the present day, and Mr. Studdert Kennedy's strangely modern and up-to-date yet moving industrial hymn. It is a wonderful story admirably told.

CORPORATE WORSHIP.

Few men in this (or any other) country were more competent to write about public worship than the late Rev. R. S. Simpson, D.D. He had in him in unequal measures the mystic and the scholar. His quiet, gentle manner and his emphasis on the devotional concealed from those who knew him only slightly the fact that he was a man of great intellectual power with a very competent outfit of scholarship. He had put aside all ambitions of a scholarly career to give himself to a ministry of comfort, which he carried on by preaching and friendship and correspondence to the great benefit of many. His conduct of public worship was regarded as rather 'high' for Scottish Presbyterianism, but as a matter of fact he was thoroughly loyal to the Presbyterian tradition. Only he had a keen sense of beauty and fitness in worship, and was eager to make it, so far as he was concerned, as catholic as possible. If the phrase may be permitted, he had devotional genius, and his appointment as Chalmers lecturer was certain to produce something unusually fine on the devotional side. The result has just been published by Messrs. T. & T. Clark in a volume entitled *Ideas in Corporate Worship* (6s. net). The lectures have not received the revision he would have given to them, but as they are they make a remarkable book.

The plan is somewhat as follows. After a discussion of what corporate worship stands for, we have a lecture on the eucharistic service, in which worship finds its supreme expression. Then the psychological and historical sides of the subject are carefully considered. Then follows a chapter of rare suggestiveness on our present-day services and on the extent to which they do or do not meet present-day needs, and finally the relation of corporate worship to private devotion is dealt with. This brief list of topics will indicate the general course of reflection. But it does nothing to reveal the richness of the book in insight, in suggestiveness, in quiet spiritual power. This is, as one would expect, a book by itself. It will repay careful and repeated reading. And in particular it would serve well the great ends for which the Church exists if all candidates for the ministry could be induced to read, mark, and inwardly digest its beautiful contents.

LUKE–ACTS.

In his work, *The Making of Luke–Acts* (Macmillan; 12s. 6d. net), Professor Henry J. Cadbury, now of Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania, aims at giving a comprehensive and realistic picture of the literary process that resulted in the production of Luke and Acts. To this task, which distinguishes his work from the usual introduction or commentary, Dr. Cadbury brings an ample and mature equipment. In the prosecution of it he examines successively the sources on which the author of Luke–Acts drew, the methods of composition which he employed, his character and personality as bearing upon the work he wrote, and his purpose in writing it. It may be gathered from this statement of the contents that the questions of authorship and historicity, usually so prominent in discussions of Luke and Acts, are in Dr. Cadbury's

discussion at the best subordinate. At the close of the volume, indeed, he refers to those questions, but he takes us no further on that of authorship than he did in his examination of the tradition in Jackson and Lake's 'The Beginnings of Christianity,' vol. ii. As for the question of historicity, his conclusions are likewise negative. His method of study, as pursued in this volume, lends itself neither to the verification nor to the correction of the data recorded in Luke and Acts. As he urges very plausibly, 'that fact itself—the making of Luke-Acts—by its concreteness, its verifiable fitness to its historical setting, and its irrefutable revelation of its author's mind, times, and heart, can lend to our study of Scripture an element of historical certainty and human interest which the more controversial and debatable subjects of date, authorship, inspiration, orthodoxy, and accuracy do not permit.' The expositor will find that this volume will illuminate for him not only the pages of Luke and Acts, but those of the New Testament generally.

SIN IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

The Rev. J. Evans Thomas, B.D., in *The Problem of Sin in the N.T.* (Black; 5s. net), goes through the New Testament, book by book, in order to discover and then to express in plain language what the Christian conception of sin is. He has done his work with care and not without success, keeping the historical background well in mind, and allowing the material to furnish him with his conclusions. Dr. John Duncan of Edinburgh used to say that our business with sin is not so much to explain it as to abolish it—and we have no doubt that this also is the motif of the New Testament, so that even the searcher for the New Testament view of sin has to keep it in mind. From this point of view we would like some treatment of 'the forgiveness of sins,' of 'the relation between forgiveness and repentance,' of 'Christ's forgiving of sin,' and of similar topics.

There is no reference in this volume, as far as we can see, to 'the remission of sins,' nor to 'He died for our sins,' surely important points, nor to difficult passages like the apparently contradictory statements in John's First Epistle—'if we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves' and 'he that is born of God sinneth not'; nor to Peter's saying, 'he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin'; nor to the Johannine passage, 'Whosesoever sins ye remit they are remitted,' etc.—surely grave omissions. While grateful for the author's matter and method, we regret these lacunæ, and perhaps in chapter xii. it might be well to remember that a theory is best considered when taken in its best light and not in the caricature of an extreme representation of it. There are many slips of language and punctuation which spoil the pleasure of the reader. It may suffice to take one chapter and point out some of these. Chapter ii. p. 12, lines 14, 28; p. 14, line 16; p. 19, line 10, 'who' omitted.

MISHNAIC HEBREW.

It is unfortunate that, for most students, the study of Hebrew, like the study of Greek, ends with the so-called classical period. Twenty people can read Herodotus for one that is at home in a modern Greek newspaper, and there are probably a hundred who can find their way through at least the historical books of the Old Testament for one who can read Rabbinic. Doubtless the prevalent ignorance of the latter is due to its intrinsic inferiority to the Old Testament, but it is also partly due to the fact that there is no such abundant guidance to its linguistic and grammatical peculiarities as lies at the disposal of the student of Old Testament Hebrew.

For the earlier Rabbinical literature at least this reproach is removed by the excellent *Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*, by Mr. M. H. Segal, M.A. (Milford; 15s. net), which is written with a twofold aim—first, the practical aim of furnishing students of early Rabbinic literature with a grammar of its dialect, and, secondly, 'to demonstrate the organic connexion of this Mishnaic dialect with Biblical Hebrew, and its relative independence of contemporary Aramaic at least in the field of grammar.' Both these aims are very successfully accomplished. Grammar and syntax are treated, much after the manner of Gesenius-Kautzsch's Hebrew Grammar, with lucidity and with much well-illustrated detail. Any one familiar with Hebrew will note with ease and interest the modifications which emerge in this later development—roughly the period 400 B.C. to about A.D. 400.

But not the least interesting feature of Mr. Segal's book is the proof he adduces in the Introduction that, while Mishnaic Hebrew was greatly influenced by Aramaic and borrows many words from foreign sources, it really rests, in much of its morphology and vocabulary, on Biblical Hebrew. Much of its vocabulary, however, is drawn from sources beyond the Hebrew Bible, and it may be

fairly described as a popular and colloquial dialect whose vocabulary was in the main drawn from the actual Hebrew speech of daily life which preceded the Mishnaic period, 'the direct lineal descendant of the spoken Hebrew of the Biblical period, as distinguished from the literary Hebrew of the Biblical period preserved in the Hebrew Scriptures.' This careful volume, besides facilitating the reading of the Mishna, is a valuable contribution to the history of the Hebrew language.

IMMORTALITY.

There have been books published on this subject almost without number in recent years—and some of them big books, and sôme of them convincing. But we question if any of them, big or little, is more persuasive than the book just written by the Right Rev. Norman Maclean, D.D., and published by Messrs. James Clarke & Co., with the title *The Future Life* (3s. 6d. net). The book grew out of a personal experience which is described in detail in the opening chapter. This chapter is so poignant, so tender, and so gracious, that it cannot be read without tears. But it ought to be read, because the force of the later chapters rests on it. And these later chapters contain a very simple statement of the conviction wrought in their author by experience and thought and feeling, working on the basis of the Christian revelation. It is all as simple as possible. But it all goes straight to the heart. It required a very real courage on the part of Dr. Maclean to lay bare this personal narrative, and many will be grateful to him that he was moved to do it. We may be silenced or convinced by the arguments of great minds on this subject of immortality. But it is a book like this transcript from life and sorrow that really helps us to see and to share the clear faith of its author. It is a very plain, quiet, unambitious book, but in reality it is in some ways a revelation.

THE EPISTLE OF ST. JAMES.

The Rev. Gerald H. Rendall, B.D., Litt.D., LL.D., in *The Epistle of St. James and Judaic Christianity* (Cambridge University Press; 7s. 6d. net), offers an intimate study of the teaching of the Epistle and of its relation to other books, canonical and extra-canonical, concentrating on all points that bear on authorship, provenance, and date. As one might have expected, it is a scholarly piece of work; yet it may be freely used by the English reader. It would provide a teacher lecturing on the Epistle with a substantial body of up-to-date material. Dr. Rendall holds a conservative view as to author and date. He favours the tradition that the author was James, brother of the Lord, who succeeded Peter as head of the Christians in Jerusalem; and he would assign the Epistle to a year between A.D. 49 and 55. Admitting that it is 'the most un-Pauline book in the New Testament,' he accounts for this on the ground that it is pre-Pauline, not because—as the advocates of a late date affirm—it has forgotten and outlived the Pauline inspiration. Accordingly, it is an inchoate Christology, and not a 'blanched Christology,' that Dr. Rendall finds in the Epistle. For him James is 'the minister of transition, leading his people from the land of bondage to the land of promise; he bridges the gulf between Judaism and Christianity, and mediates the passage from the old dispensation to the new.' It is not often nowadays that a conservative view in New Testament criticism is advocated with the ability and scholarship shown by Dr. Rendall; and we think he has written a book which should be commended to the notice and consideration of critical students.

THE NECESSITY OF REDEMPTION.

The Necessity of Redemption (Longmans; 7s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Percy Hartill, B.D., Vice-Principal of Lichfield Theological College, is an attempt to show the necessity of Christ's Atonement to any rational conception of the universe. The author begins by stating the philosophic problem involved in his thesis, which is the problem of evil. After passing in rapid review (too rapid and superficial to be satisfying) the dualisms of Bertrand Russell, H. G. Wells, and other supporters of the notion of a 'finite God,' as also the monisms of the absolute idealist, the pantheist, and others, he seeks to effect a reconciliation of the monist and dualist trains of thought. The old theistic question, *Si deus bonus est, unde malum?* is identified with that which Anselm states as the problem of the Atonement: what reparation, he asks, can be made to the honour of God as that the Divine Nature shall not suffer loss through sin? Which brings Mr. Hartill to the purpose of his essay, namely, to show that the atoning work of Christ is the creative act for which reason cries out. Thenceforward his touch is surer and firmer, and he presents in the light of recent English writings on the Atonement a reasonable plea for the recognition of Christ's saving work as showing an 'objective'

Godward aspect. But one has the feeling in reading the book that Mr. Hartill's formulation of the philosophical conditions of an intelligible view of the universe has been largely determined by the Christian answer itself, as set forth in the traditional or Anselmic orthodoxy. The essay concludes with a reference to the main historic theories of the Atonement and to some kindred questions, such as that of 'Divine Impassibility,' on which Dr. J. K. Mozley and the late Baron von Hügel have recently written.

PASCAL.

We have seldom read a book with more pleasure and more sustained interest than this book, *Pascal: The Man and the Message*, by Mr. Roger H. Soltau, M.A. (Blackie; 10s. 6d. net), and we congratulate author and publishers alike on the excellency of the volume. As we gather from the Preface, the book owes its genesis to lectures delivered to students in the Honours School of French in the University of Leeds—presumably, therefore, the attraction was first the marvel of Pascal's literary style and purity of diction, which gave him such a high place in French literature. This but proves the contention of John Foster that religious literature should not despise literary form, and, if we may say so, the author charms by the clearness and beauty of his literary style.

But the abiding interest and attraction of Pascal is that he was a master of the deep things of the soul and a sincere lover of truth. His life is even a nobler apologetic for Christianity than his thoughts, and that is saying much, but it is only saying what a freethinker like Bayle said: 'It was worth more than a hundred volumes of sermons and far more able to disarm unbelievers. The extraordinary humility and devotion of Pascal has convinced sceptics far more than if one were to let loose on them a dozen missionaries.'

In this volume you find the incidents of his life —his training by his father, his mathematical precocity, and achievements in practical science, his religious awakening, his high and austere morals, his famous exposure of casuistry, his connexion with Port Royal, and his contribution to Christian apologetic through his 'Thoughts'— all handled with scrupulous fairness and balanced judgment. Pascal is viewed in the light of his time—the accidents of his thoughts and practices separated from the permanent worth of his outlook and experience. A fine and splendid discrimination pervades the whole treatment, so that we have here not only the work of an adequate historian, and of a distinguished stylist, but also the fruits of a delicate spiritual insight. We rejoice in such a book—a great theme handled in a great way; and if the author were to handle another great Frenchman—John Calvin—in this manner he would confer on many a great boon.

NEAR EAST EXCAVATION.

All who are interested in the ancient Near East, especially its Egyptological and Assyriological aspects, will welcome a new volume by the Rev. James Baikie, F.R.A.S., *The Glamour of Near East Excavation* (Seeley, Service; 10s. 6d. net), which gives an account of the treasure-hunt for the buried art, wisdom, and history of the ancient East from the Nile to Babylon, the adventures, disappointments, and triumphs of the hunters, and the knowledge thus acquired of the ancient world. Mr. Baikie, with his wide knowledge of the subject, combined with a fascinating literary style and a special talent for descriptive writing, makes his readers see the forgotten past as a living thing. There is a graphic account of excavations in Egypt, Assyro-Babylonia, and Palestine, including the golden age of the Pharaohs with its wonders of art and craft, the glory of Thebes, the wonderful romance of the tomb of Tutankhamen, the recent discoveries at Jerusalem, Lagash, Ur, and other centres, and even the prizes and humours of papyrus-hunting. Stress is laid on the extent to which the excavator's methods have developed from the days of Balzoni, Drovetti, and others. The book contains a wealth of information, up-to-date, and luminously set forth by a master-hand. It should be of interest to Biblical students as enabling them to understand much that lies behind the history of Israel. 'It is one of the unexpected things in life,' says Mr. Baikie, 'that we can look into an actual kitchen of the days of Abraham, and see the very utensils lying as they were left, and the marks of the chopper on the block, and the smoke of the sacrifices on the walls' (p. 260). In connexion with the stele of Rameses II. discovered at Beisân, Mr. Baikie wisely refrains from accepting the current interpretation of the inscription, according to which Semitic tribes—even the Israelites, it has been stated—worked at the building of that Pharaoh's name-city in the Delta. The passage is now known to refer merely to some Semites bringing their customary tribute to the city. Mr. Baikie states (p. 166) that 'Nefertiti seems to have been full

sister to her husband Akhenaten.' The same statement appears in many popular books, but no evidence has ever been produced: her origin is quite unknown. Readers will find in the book a profitable study, showing how the people of the Near East, kings and commoners, lived in ancient times, what they thought, and how they contributed to the long story of human progress. It contains twenty-six suggestive illustrations, as well as an excellent index.

A COMPREHENSIVE THEOLOGY.

In *God, Christ, and the Church* (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net) the Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, D.D., has brought together a number of articles published in various periodicals. He claims, truly enough, that they form a connected series; and if there is a good deal of repetition, that was to be expected, and is not altogether a defect in the discussion of such lofty themes. As a matter of fact, the ideas put forward are definitely limited in number, and appear once and again in new connexions. They indicate what Dr. Scott Lidgett's working creed is, and it certainly is a creed worth expounding and worth defending. The title of the book is comprehensive, but not more so than the contents which really furnish an *apologia* for faith in a general sense and for faith in Christ and the Christian religion in particular. A considerable section is added on 'The Church,' which deals really with the questions involved in the reunion proposals. This section, interesting as it is, might very well have been omitted or published separately, as its interest is not really comparable with the burden of the first, and theological, section.

The book is well written in a style that lacks brightness. There is nothing slovenly about either thinking or expression. It is all good, honest, clear argument, close in texture, but never difficult. Dr. Scott Lidgett makes his points and exhausts them before he passes on, and he is always interesting and always persuasive. The main ideas of the book are these. Spiritual values are everything in the universe. These are incarnated in personality, and especially in the personality of Christ, who is not to be set over against the universe but is an integral part of it, its crown and its meaning. The nature of God is seen in these spiritual values, and God is therefore not only love but sovereignty, and the Old Testament is as integral a part of revelation as the New. The calling of man is therefore to seek abiding satisfaction in this eternal order. These ideas are presented with captivating earnestness and with immense ability. And when we read this book we feel that we are in contact with a mind that is both well-equipped, fair, and steadfast. That is a comfort, and it will be so not for students only but for the large number of interested laymen for whom it provides easily understood guidance.

THE PASSION OF OUR LORD.

The Divine Revolution, by Mr. W. G. Peck (S.C.M.; 6s. net), is a remarkable book of 'studies and reflections upon the Passion of our Lord.' The writer's views on religious and social questions are already generally known. He is essentially a man with a message, and there is an urge and passion in all his writings which cannot fail to make a deep impression on the reader. It is good in these days of conflicting theories and fluctuating criticism to encounter a man of decided Christian conviction, a whole-hearted believer in the divinity of our Lord and the power of His cross. Briefly the argument of the book is that 'in going to the Cross our Lord was revealing the divine activity in its essential nature,' that 'the Cross is a great divine act, revealing the regulative principle of society in the purpose of God, and not only the divine mercy for the individual.' A detailed study of the Gospel narratives is found to establish four propositions: '(1) That our Lord had from the beginning a clear expectation of an early and violent death at the hands of His enemies, and that to this event He attached a tremendous significance. (2) That His attitude to this death was one of resolute and positive choice, in such wise that it becomes His own action. (3) That He regarded it as of fundamental necessity for the production of certain glorious effects. (4) That He regarded it as constituting a revolutionary sanction for the lives of men.' It is in dealing with the last of these propositions that the writer is particularly arresting. 'If the self-destructive course of human activity is to be reversed, we who profess Christ as Lord must be prepared for a real participation in His opposition to the world. For the Church is the revolutionary society, and the Christian life is the revolutionary life, involving a daily controversy with the plausible and familiar. The Cross, indeed, is so revolutionary as to be in opposition, not only to the human social order, but also to most of the revolutions against that order which have ever been attempted or proposed.' If at times the writer appears vehement, it is the vehemence of the

prophet in whose bones the Word is burning like a fire, and who feels impelled to 'cry aloud and spare not.' Here is a book which will give fresh heart to many a preacher and fresh point to many a sermon.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS.

Friends of the late Dr. H. H. Scullard have performed a pious and meritorious act in publishing posthumously his book on Christian Ethics, *The Ethics of the Gospel and the Ethics of Nature* (S.C.M.; 10s. 6d. net). The work was practically ready for publication, and Principal Garvie writes a commendatory Preface. The main purpose of the book is to give some account first of the Ethics of the Gospel, and then of attempts which have been made to find the foundations of morality in 'Nature.' The author thinks that he has demonstrated that the first type of Ethics, which is based on the Biblical ideas of the Gospel, is the only one which rests upon a solid foundation; and that the second appears to have collapsed, and the more often it recovers and confronts its rival, the weaker it appears. 'Morality,' says the author, 'is so important an interest for mankind that it ought to be known to rest on the broadest and surest foundation,' and he finds in the science of religion, in which he includes Theology, the only adequate foundation for morals.

Like many more, this book is far stronger on the negative than on the positive side. With great acumen the author criticises and shows the weakness of all 'naturalistic' systems, ancient and modern. The weakness of the book seems to us to lie in his failure to appreciate the real difficulty, which many minds feel in discovering in the Bible, either a sure foundation for, or a clear teaching in, Ethics. The ordinary Christian mind is not greatly interested in theories of utility or in other forms of naturalistic Ethics. The ordinary Christian mind is always founded upon what it takes to be the teaching of Scripture, and it is notorious how different Christians have come to the most diverse conclusions as to the particulars of their Christian duty. This difficulty, so far as we can see, is not realized by the author. Yet we can thoroughly recommend the book as in many points fresh and suggestive.

The well-known argument of David Hume on the subject of Miracles has often enough had its fallacy shown up. The most trenchant criticism and best evaluation that we have seen comes from the able pen of Professor A. E. Taylor of the University of Edinburgh—*David Hume and the Miraculous* (Cambridge University Press; 2s. 6d. net). Professor Taylor, in his own interesting manner and his own lucid English, indicates that Hume in this famous passage was probably seeking simply notoriety. He then goes on to show how Hume varies in the meaning he attaches to Miracle, and shows convincingly that, on his own principles, his argument against Theology would tell equally against Science.

We have received and read with great pleasure *Roma Sacra*, Essays on Christian Rome, by the Rev. William Barry, D.D. (Longmans; 10s. 6d. net). It consists of nine essays and is provided with an Index of Names. The very extent of the Index testifies to the wide reading and scholarly qualities of the author. The most interesting of the Essays are on The Holy Latin Tongue, Our Latin Bible, The Liturgy of Toledo, Pope and Emperor, The Angelic Doctor, The Gold of Dante, and Catholicism and the Spirit of the East. The style of the book is stately and the diction beautiful. We shall not be expected to agree with all or perhaps even many of the author's conclusions, but we are sincere in our admiration of his scholarly, temperate, and broad-minded outlook. Here is a taste of the book: 'Why now did Christian Rome prove stronger than the Rome of Marcus Aurelius? It was because philosophers could not give people a religion; nor the Stoics do away with superstition; nor the law create morality; nor art and culture satisfy the soul; . . . nor the Emperor's "Meditations" bring men strength and joy like the Gospel. Before that exquisite and stately vision of things human, when the Empire was at rest, Marcus himself felt weary. It seemed a reminiscence, an autumnal scene, bearing no promise of spring. . . . Pagan Rome was dead. Humanism had no power to save it. But into its hollow moulds and decrepit language and empty shrines the Church of the Martyrs poured a new life. Rome was born again at the Confession of St. Peter.'

To write the history of the first thirteen centuries of Christianity within the space of one hundred and sixty pages of about two hundred and sixty words each strikes us at first hearing as the kind of task which should not be attempted. The Rev. G. W. Butterworth, M.A., Litt.D., however, has not only attempted it but done it surprisingly well in *A Study of Church History*, to the End of the Thirteenth

Century (S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net). Nothing important has been omitted, and by means of the books suggested at the end of each chapter, the general reader and even the student will find in this little work a just conspectus of the ground to be covered. We notice one or two things which might well be amended. While Montanism is described, its great significance for the development of the Catholic Church is not brought out. In the chapter dealing with the conflict between the popes and the emperors, fewer details of names and dates might have been given and the broad lines of the conflict more clearly set forth. It cannot be held, either, that the causes of the Schism between East and West are clearly indicated. The only inaccuracy which we have noticed lies on page 110: 'Extermination or slavery are the fate of those who oppose the sword of the prophet.' Apart from the bad grammar, *slavery* is a mistake for *tribute*—a very different thing. Despite these few blemishes, the manual will nevertheless prove very useful.

Christianity in the Roman World, by the Rev. Duncan Armytage, M.A. (Bell; 6s. net), is an admirable piece of work. It was begun 'as the result of a suggestion that it would be useful for the upper forms of public schools if a book could be written which would "Christianize the appropriate chapters in Gibbon."' It may be said at once that the writer has been highly successful in his task. He is endowed with some of the finest gifts of the historian—a well-balanced judgment, carefulness in investigation, a luminous imagination, and a vivid style. He depicts the religious chaos of the Roman Empire—the old traditional religion struggling against the Oriental cults—and against that background he traces the growth and expansion of Christianity to the fall of the Empire in the West. Particularly good is his account of the old native religions which Christianity superseded. He has also a notable chapter under the heading, 'Who is Christ?' in which he gives an account, at once clear and full of dramatic interest, of the great Christological controversies of the fourth and fifth centuries. This is a book which ought to be popular, for it fills a real blank and makes the story of early Christianity read like a romance.

An event of importance in the world of New Testament study is the new edition of the 'Cambridge Greek Testament' under the general editorship of Professor Nairne. We have received *The Gospel according to S. Matthew,* edited, with Introduction and Notes, by Mr. B. T. D. Smith, M.A., of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge (Cambridge University Press; 6s. net). The previous edition, edited by Mr. A. Carr, first appeared in 1881; and the present editor has made good use of the results established in the interval, as embodied in such recent writings as those of Burkitt, Streeter, and Jackson and Lake. The introduction and notes are judicial and well-balanced. The Greek text is that of Westcott and Hort; the references to authorities have for the most part been taken from Souter's edition of the Greek Testament.

The question whether the Church of England is in its constitution Protestant has been much canvassed since the High Church party gained its present pre-eminence. To the outsider the extraordinary varieties in doctrine and practice within that Church are most perplexing, and at the moment the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper and the nature of Christ's presence therein is a storm centre. The publication of *Continental Protestantism and the English Reformation,* by the Rev. F. J. Smithen, B.A. (James Clarke; 6s. net), may, in the circumstances, be regarded as opportune. It is a book which, as Professor Carnegie Simpson says in a foreword, 'supplies in a reliable and accessible form what is really needed by all students of the English Reformation, and what it would take no small amount of trouble to gather and arrange for themselves.' The writer has, with great labour and research, traced the influence of the leading continental reformers on the Church of England at its formative period, and shown in detail the marks of that influence on the Articles and Liturgy, both in language and doctrine. In reply to Newman's argument that the Thirty-Nine Articles are capable of bearing a 'catholic' interpretation he asks pertinently: 'If the compilers of the English Articles did not want their work to be interpreted in a Lutheran or Calvinistic sense, why did they borrow their very language from Lutheran Confessions and express some doctrines in a way closely parallel to the statements put forth by the Reformed theologians?'

The Principle of the Congregational Churches, by the Rev. A. D. Martin (Congregational Union; 2s. 6d.), is 'not a history of Congregationalism, but an exposition of the principle upon which Congregational Churches have been founded, and by which they live to-day.' It is, however, historical in the main, and gives in rapid outline a vivid

sketch of the landmarks in the story of Congregationalism. Some thoughtful chapters are added, dealing with the applications of the principle in devotion, in business, and in Christian service. The book is written primarily for the young people of the denomination, and it will be found a most interesting and helpful guide.

The Christian Approach to the Jew (Edinburgh House Press; 2s. 6d. net) is a report of two Conferences held at Budapest and Warsaw in April 1927. The official findings of the Conferences are printed both in English and in German. Of more interest and value, doubtless, to the general reader are the appendices, which contain summaries of answers to a questionnaire, and a selection of special papers written preparatory to the Conferences. All who are interested in Jewish missions will find in them a considerable store of useful information.

A valiant attempt is made in *Christian Evidences and Teaching*, by the Rev. R. P. Hadden, a missionary in China (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net), to vindicate the traditional position with regard to the Bible. The 'days' of creation are taken as periods in face of the obvious pains the writer of Genesis takes to make it clear that the 'days' are real days when he says repeatedly 'and evening and morning were the first day, the second day,' and so on. There is no discrepancy, the writer says, between the Bible and the facts of science. The old unhistorical view of prophecy and its 'fulfilment' is adopted. Some of the explanations of discrepancies are very feeble. But on the whole the book is an intelligent one, and says as much for traditionalism as can be said. The fundamentalist will find much comfort in it.

Comfort and Courage, by the Rev. Ronald G. Macintyre, C.M.G., D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net), is a book of devotional studies characterized by unusual qualities of spiritual insight and literary charm. The writer, having passed through deep waters himself, writes with tender sympathy and Christian hopefulness. There is nothing weakly sentimental, and many who would turn with distaste from conventional books of comfort may find real help here.

The Missionary Ideal in the Scottish Churches, by the Rev. D. Mackichan, D.D., LL.D., F.R.S.E. (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), is the Chalmers' Lectures for 1926. It is, as one might expect from the experience and vision of the writer, a very weighty and judicial pronouncement. In one respect there is, perhaps, a certain lack of balance in the treatment. Principal Mackichan's life has been given to India, and the Missions of the Scottish Churches in Africa, China, and elsewhere receive little more than a passing reference. On the other hand, it may well be thought that the writer has done wisely in illustrating his subject from the field in which he is an acknowledged authority. Of special value are his defence of educational missions, and his discussion of Indian nationalism and the vexed question of the conscience clause. He has also a careful and suggestive estimate of the reaction of the missionary ideal on Christian thought and life, in which he treats especially the question of how far Hinduism may be regarded as a *preparatio evangelica*. An epilogue is added in which some grave cautions are given against accepting without qualification the impressions of India's attitude to Christ which have recently received wide currency through 'The Christ of the Indian Road.'

'At last!' one feels inclined to breathe when one handles the perfectly delightful *Pocket Bible* issued by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton, and edited by Mr. Arthur Mee (6s. net). One of the urgent needs of to-day is a selected Bible in good type and without chapters or verses, printed and bound like an ordinary book, and in decently small compass. And here it is at last! It would be difficult to speak too highly of this achievement. We wish the price had been less, but perhaps that cannot be helped. Or perhaps later on it can be lessened. This is such a precious gift that we hope it will circulate in many thousands.

It would be difficult to issue any selection that would not be open to criticism. And we have our grudge against Mr. Mee. Why are all the stories of Judges omitted? Surely room might have been made for Gideon and for Deborah's song (savage as it is). And why is Nehemiah's wonderful autobiography left out? We would have spared even a psalm or two in order to include Nehemiah. In a reprint we hope these omissions will be supplied. And there is not even a page from Ezekiel. However, we must be thankful to see such a thing done, and done so well.

'A dog in a picture gallery,' says Oliver Lodge in his vivid way, 'interested only in smells and corners, may represent, as in a parable, much of our own attitude to the universe.' If we can

imagine the dog becoming aware of the beauty in the pictures, something new will have to rise up within him to meet this new situation, this larger world, in which he finds himself. Now, says Dr. J. Cyril Flower, in *An Approach to the Psychology of Religion* (Kegan Paul; 10s. 6d. net), man in his upward climb has at times found himself in a world grown too large for him to deal adequately with it through his inherited instincts, sufficient though these were for the old, smaller world he used to know; and to meet the new position, to deal with this 'utterly beyondness' which confronts him, he has to develop new powers, and one of them, the most impressive of them, is religion. Then follow studies of the Winnebago Indians, a particularly uninteresting set of people; and of George Fox, of whom we are hearing more than enough, for to some of us he is by far the least attractive of the saints; and of conversion, without carrying us much further than we were. There is, moreover, some shrewd criticism of the wilder spirits, like Jung and Martin, though one wonders if that is worth while.

Mr. A. Rendle Short, in his little volume entitled *In the Days of the Prophet Isaiah* (Marshall Brothers; 2s. 6d. net), has struck out a somewhat new line of exposition, which combines for the reader the maximum of information with the minimum of trouble. By skilfully weaving together utterances of Isaiah relative to the same event or period, and by a judicious exercise of the imagination, he has succeeded in writing a really vivid narrative, which has the double advantage of keeping the reader close to the facts of the book and of lighting up those facts so that the various situations are not only alive but luminous. The author need not apologize for the imaginative use of his material—it is inevitable; nor need he apologize for his chronological rearrangement—that too is inevitable and will be welcome to intelligent readers who are puzzled by the traditional sequence of the prophecies. Any one who reads this small book will win from it a vivid appreciation of Isaiah and his times.

Some Authentic Acts of the Early Martyrs, by Mr. E. C. E. Owen (Milford; 6s. net), is an edition, with Introduction and Notes, intended primarily for the general reader, of 'The Martyrdom of S. Polycarp,' 'The Acts of the Scillitan Saints,' 'The Passion of SS. Perpetua and Felicitas,' 'The Acts of S. Cyprian,' and other records (thirteen in all) of the early Christian martyrdoms. Some of these Acts have never been fully translated into English before, and we are indebted to Mr. Owen for presenting them to us in translations which bear the marks of scholarly skill and accuracy. In the General Introduction he gives an account of the position of the early Christians in the Roman Empire, and examines the causes of the persecutions, indicating, for example, why it was that the Jewish religion, which also forbade sacrifice to the Emperor, was a 'religio licita,' and the Christian banned. Mr. Owen's volume, like Mr. R. W. Muncey's, 'The Passion of S. Perpetua' (reviewed in a previous issue), would be in some quarters a welcome Christmas gift-book.

A number of volumes of lesson-notes on the current lessons have reached us. We only mention them, as they have all the same characteristics. They are carefully, fully, and wisely constructed as lesson helps. There is scholarship behind them, and teaching experience and ample resources in the way of illustration. They are *The Concise Guide to the 1928 Lessons* (3s. 6d. net), an admirable and exceedingly cheap production; *Lesson-Stories on Jewish Leaders* (1s.); *Lesson-Stories on the Bible and Worship* (a popular guide to the nature of Scripture and its make-up; 1s.); *Lesson-Stories on Citizenship* (1s.). These are all edited by Mr. Ernest H. Hayes, a name that is a guarantee of efficiency, and published by the National Sunday School Union. In addition, from the same publishers come *Notes on the Scripture Lessons for the Year 1928* (the British Uniform or International Lessons; 3s. 6d. net), and *Notes on the Morning Lessons, 1928* (2s. 6d. net), both by Mr. J. Eaton Feasey. Finally, a small booklet, easily carried in the waistcoat pocket, of *The International Lesson Pocket Notes for 1928*, by Mr. W. D. Bavin (1s. 9d.). These all have the imprimatur of the National Sunday School Union, and are all by competent and experienced teachers.

To 'The Old Testament for Schools' series, Principal A. R. Whitham, M.A., has contributed two volumes dealing respectively with the First and Second Books of *Kings* (Rivingtons; 2s. 6d. each). The Commentary proper, which is simple, but informative and thoroughly adequate, is prefaced in each volume by a discussion of the value of Old Testament history and by a useful historical survey. The books are well fitted to initiate boys into the results of modern scholarship, and also to create in them a reverent appreciation of the whole historical movement which issued

in Jesus. At points in the narrative where the question of miracle is involved the treatment will seem to some modernists scarcely modern enough. For example, in 1 K 13^2 the announcement of Josiah by name is a 'remarkable prediction'; in 2 K 2^{11}, Elisha (it is 'reverently conjectured') may have caught a glimpse of his master's soul being carried into the heavens; in 2 K 6^6 the floating iron is explained by remembering that the 'laws' of Nature are the will of a personal God, who is able, for His own purposes, to suspend or modify them; and most surprising of all is the comment on the story of the rising of the dead man through contact with the bones of Elisha (2 K 13^{21}). But perhaps it is well that boys who are learning something of modern methods and results in Biblical criticism should be allowed to see what can be said for conservative positions. One really provoking feature of the volumes is that there is no indication of the chapter and verse at the top of the page, and one has often to engage in a time-wasting search for the passage one wants. This should be rectified in subsequent volumes.

The new volume in the 'Translations of Early Documents' series, dealing with *The Testament of Abraham*, by the Rev. G. H. Box, D.D., and *The Testaments of Isaac and Jacob*, by the Rev. S. Gaselee, M.A. (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net), is of quite unusual interest. Sometimes these documents, however much they may illuminate the world of ancient ideas, are dreary enough to a modern taste. Not so this volume, which, besides throwing incidental light on certain New Testament phrases and ideas, is as absorbing as a romance. The narrative which, though moving in the realm of unhistorical imaginations, is charged with pathos, describes how reluctant the hospitable Abraham was to part from this earthly scene. Michael is commissioned by God to receive his soul, but Abraham refuses to yield it up, until, after many curious experiences, the angel of death visits him, and in the end he is borne away to Paradise. The narrative raises many interesting questions, for example, about the value of intercessory prayer. Alike in its theology and general literary character, the book appears to be thoroughly Jewish in origin. The translation is as lucid as the narrative is interesting, and the Introduction gives all the help necessary to the understanding of it.

My Faith, by Canon Vernon F. Storr (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net), is an excellent little handbook of Christian doctrine, intended for the instruction of young people belonging to the Church of England. It is written from the evangelical standpoint, and though studiously courteous and fair, it is decisive in its rejection of ritualistic doctrines and practices. The style is lucid, the technicalities of theology have been avoided, and the book is well fitted to inform and instruct young people in all the Churches.

The cause of Church union would be decidedly advanced by such a book as *The Heights of Christian Unity: A Plea for one Holy Catholic Church*, by Professor Doremus A. Hayes of Illinois (S.C.M.; 4s. 6d. net), if only the author could find people as broad-minded as himself. 'We believe,' he writes, 'that any form of Church government might well be sacrificed to bring about a reunited Christendom.' What Church anywhere would echo that liberal opinion? The things that divide churches are things in which they believe truth to be involved. And truth is involved for each of them in Church government, in the Sacrament, and in the Creed. Professor Hayes can find nothing that *ought* to separate churches. And if we all agreed with him there would be only one Catholic Church in the world to-morrow. But that to-morrow is a long way off. Still, such a plea as his, urged as it is in so Christian and Catholic a spirit, will do good wherever it is sympathetically read. The line or argument may be guessed from the divisions: (1) Fundamentals; (2) Hindrances; and (3) Help. The book was worth writing and it is well written, and (for at least one reader!) convincingly.

A well-informed and balanced book on *Religion and Dramatic Art* has been written by the Rev. Spencer Elliott, M.A., Vicar and Rural Dean of Mansfield (S.C.M.; 4s. 6d. net). Mr. Elliott is a stout defender of the drama, but not a blind defender. He allows for the Puritan point of view and sees clearly the truth in it. But he sees as clearly the claims of dramatic art and states them partly in set terms but partly also, and interestingly, through a historical survey. We begin with dramatic origins in the Hindu festival dramas, and wend our way through Aristotle, the Greek tragedy, the drama of Rome in the early Christian era (a specially interesting chapter), the mediæval stage, Shakespeare, the Puritan period, French classical drama, to Faust. The review is completed by a chapter on the modern drama by Mr. C. F.

Cameron, dramatic critic of the *Sheffield Daily Telegraph*. These chapters are full of an amazing erudition, but it is learning lightly worn, for it is all extraordinarily pleasant to read. And no sensible person who knows anything about life will disagree with the writer's final conclusions. The drama is one of the great human interests, and it is the only possible attitude of intelligent religious people to use it for the best ends.

The Parable of the Untrustworthy Steward (Luke xvi. 1-13).

A QUESTION REOPENED.

By the Reverend H. S. Marshall, S. Boniface College, Warminster.

The interpretations and comments on the puzzling Parable of the Unrighteous Steward are well-nigh endless. 'It cannot be expected for us,' says Stier, 'to unravel the fearfully tangled perplexities of the comments which from the most ancient times down to our own day . . . have darkened and confused this parable of our Lord, in itself and in its fundamental theme so plain.' And Dr. Plummer tells us that 'the steward has been supposed to mean the Jewish hierarchy, the tax-collectors, Pilate, Judas, Satan, penitents, St. Paul, Christ.' In *Conscience and its Problems*, Dr. Kirk says that there are occasions (of which this is one) when 'simplification is only a parody of truth.' He would suggest that our Lord Himself hints at four separate ways of interpreting the parable.

It would therefore seem almost an impertinence to reopen the question; especially with a suggestion which is in the nature of a simplification. Yet may it not be that the first suggestion in Dr. Plummer's list may have some validity?

Of the four interpretations to which Dr. Kirk refers, 'Ye cannot serve God and Mammon' is plain and easy to understand. But the sayings, (1) 'The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light'; (2) 'If ye have been unfaithful in that which is another's, who will give you that which is your own?'; and (3) 'Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness,' carry with them implications whose difficulty cannot be avoided, as witness the 'tangled perplexities of the comments' which they have evoked. That 'the children of this world *are* in their generation wiser than the children of light' as a statement of fact may be perfectly true; and if we take it as such, the difficulty disappears. But if, with the majority of commentators, we suppose that our Lord is encouraging what we generally speak of as 'worldly wisdom,' it is impossible not to feel somehow the suggestion does not ring true. Even if (with Loisy) we understand a transference of 'worldly' into 'heavenly' wisdom — 'worldly people show more cleverness in their mundane affairs than those who are more or less really eager for heaven show in setting about getting there'—it is difficult to think that such trivial teaching comes from the lips of the world's greatest Teacher. It is far more what we should expect from an enthusiastic but irritated cleric in an unguarded moment. May it be respectfully suggested, therefore, that this sentence is not interpretation but adumbration?

We are left, then, with (1) 'If ye have been unfaithful,' etc., and (2) 'Make friends of the mammon of unrighteousness.' To take the former without the sentence which precedes it is, surely, to put the cart before the horse. The statement 'If ye have been unfaithful in that which is another's, who will give you that which is your own?' would appear to be, if not an appeal to men's lower motives, at all events pointing to a conclusion that is in the nature of an anti-climax. The way of the world is to test a man's trustworthiness in his own affairs before committing to him the interests of others. But if again, it is embroidery; if we suppose that the main sentence is that which precedes it, namely, 'If, then, you have proved untrustworthy in worldly affairs, who will entrust to you that which really matters? (τὸ ἀληθινόν)'; then 'your own' (ὑμέτερον ℵ, A, D, etc., Versions, Cyp., Cyr. Alex., etc.: but ἡμέτερον, B.L., and Origen) is not private property contrasted with trust property, but the gospel, true religion, revealed truth, genuine morality. There remains the enormously difficult sentence, 'Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteous-

ness ; that, when ye fail, they may receive you into everlasting habitations.' As it appears in the A.V. translation, it is difficult in any connexion ; but the difficulty is enhanced by the emphasis laid upon it by the Lord's solemn καὶ ἐγὼ ὑμὶν λέγω which points to its interpreting the main lesson of the parable. It will be well first to contrast with the translation in the Authorized Version that in the Revised, which is as follows :

> 'Make to yourselves friends *by means of*[1] the mammon of unrighteousness ; that, when *it* shall fail, they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles.'

On this the Vulgate provides an interesting commentary :

> 'Facite vobis amicos *de* mamona iniquitatis : ut cum defecer*itis* recipiant vos in aeterna tabernacula.'

The italics, of course, are ours.

It is not really difficult to suppose that μαμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας stands in general for 'the world' in the Johannine sense. We are not bound to think that it is a specific condemnation of wealth, or indeed that it is necessarily confined to money or property. Its context certainly suggests a commercial or trading connexion ; but, after all, so does 'the world.' To suppose anything else only introduces unnecessary complications. There are, however, two points which require to be noticed. (1) Whereas A.V. says 'Make to yourselves friends of,' R.V. says 'by means of' or 'out of' ; and Vulgate uses 'de.' A.V. is definitely misleading. Modern speech understands 'making friends of' in the sense of 'making friends with' ; and it shocks the average mind to suppose that our Lord taught any one to make friends with anything unrighteous, especially with a view to future benefit. The ingenious attempts to get over the difficulty are far from convincing. One commentary after another repeats the dictum that benevolence, almsgiving, charitable relief are here being taught. But while this may appeal to the rich and the well-to-do, it has little or no appeal for the many whose life is a struggle with poverty—of whom were probably the majority of the Lord's hearers. Nor is the motive, namely, prudence or self-interest, easy to square with 'do not even the publicans the same ?'[2] Almsgiving and the like, our Lord seems to teach, should spring from the motive of love. The text of R.V. almost makes the matter worse. 'By means of' may indeed be an interpretation of ἐκ, but it is an unusual way of translating it. The marginal note 'out of' is surely much more correct. Liddell and Scott, quoting Hdt. 3. 83, ἐκ τοῦ μέσου κατῆστο, allows 'apart from,' and if this were accepted it would give 'eternal habitations' more point ; but undoubtedly the proper meaning of ἐκ is 'out of,' 'forth from.' 'Of' in this sense is permissible (cf. Jn 3[1], ἐκ τῶν φαρίσαιων), but, since it is misleading in the place we are considering, 'out of' or 'from the midst of'—using it as of origin—is far better. To this the Vulgate 'de' referring to persons and things 'from among,' 'out of' would agree. So far then, it would seem, the paragraph should run : 'Make to yourselves friends from the midst of the mammon of unrighteousness.' The second half of the paragraph presents a further difficulty. Are we to read ἐκλίπῃ[3] or ἐκλίπητε[4] ? 'When *it* (the world) fails—suffers an eclipse,' or 'When *ye* fail (or are eclipsed)—die' ? Here Vulgate agrees with A.V. against R.V.—as we shall suggest, wrongly.

If we now go back to the parable itself, it will be found that much will depend upon the view that is taken of Stewardship. In the West in our own time we suppose a land-agent or bailiff or person in similar position to collect certain fixed and determined rents ; but in the East and in our Lord's time, as Latham says, 'we know so little of the way in which estates were managed that the relations between the steward and his lord are imperfectly conceived, and much of the difficulty of this parable arises from this cause.' Latham suggests that the steward was paid by a poundage on the receipts, or by some similar method, so that his interest and his master's would, generally speaking, coincide. But, is it not possible to suppose that the arrangement was one by which the steward covenanted to pay his master a certain fixed sum and that he reimbursed himself and made such profit as he could on the transaction ? On this view, the steward of the parable was not acting unjustly in remitting certain sums to the tenants. He was not making free with his master's income,[5] but rather was performing an act of tardy justice involving, not his master, but himself in pecuniary loss. The dereliction of the steward lay in the fact that (*a*) he had administered the property unsatisfactorily, and (*b*) he had been grossly overburdening the tenants. Now if the application be not concerned with wealth, property, or worldly wisdom ; but

[1] Gr. 'out of' (see R.V. marg.). [2] Mt 5[46].

[3] ℵ, A, B, D, etc., Syr., Boh., Arm., Aeth.

[4] F, R, U, etc., Vulg., Goth.

[5] 'How much owest thou unto my lord ?' would be a conventional phrase.

with principles of true religion: if the steward represents the Jewish Church (the Sanhedrin, perhaps, or the scribes and Pharisees); then the whole parable takes a different aspect, the cap fits and the 'moral' is clear. The Jewish Church had certainly failed. Like the steward, it had wasted the Lord's goods—frittering them away in little sillinesses, such as tithing mint, rue and cummin. It had brought the majestic Law of God into contempt. It had put the letter before the spirit. Its failure necessitated the sending of the 'beloved son' (Lk 20^{1-16}). It was, in fact, to be deposed. Not only had it failed in stewardship. It had demanded too much. It had imposed upon men 'burdens too hard to be borne'; burdens which in common justice needed remission. It had become aloof from the facts of everyday life. The parable, addressed as it is πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς, to the disciples or the Church of the future, indicates the very important truth, so frequently found in the Prophets and *par excellence* in our Lord's teaching, that true religion must rise above legalism. It warns against Rigorism on the one hand, and that frivolously lax casuistry which springs from it on the other. Furthermore, Dr. Kirk's four corollaries fall into place.

(*a*) 'Ye cannot serve God and mammon' will still remain a general truth, but its particular application can be seen in the false use of casuistry which aims at adapting Rigorism to an extremely lax position; which tries, in short, to make religion easy for all.

(*b*) 'The children of this world are in their generation wiser than the children of light' is, as we have already seen, adumbration. But it has a special significance when we remember that 'ordinary people' often do arrive at moral intuitions surprisingly superior to those of ecclesiastical technique. In remitting the burdens of the tenants at his own cost the steward was doing rather a big thing—tardily perhaps and under strong compulsion—but genuine and right. His conscience was a better guide here than further legalistic manipulation.

(*c*) 'If ye have been unfaithful,' etc.; or, as we have seen, 'If ye have proved untrustworthy in worldly affairs, who will entrust to you that which really matters?' is a warning which springs naturally from the interpretation we suggest. There may be some hint that even Rabbinic casuistry had been further debased in application. But in any case it is a warning to the disciples against falling into the same pitfall as had the Jewish Church (cf. Mk 8^{15}); and it is possible to accept ἡμέτερον, 'your and my religion.'

(*d*) 'I say to you: Make to yourselves friends from the midst of the mammon of unrighteousness, that, when it fails, they may receive you (now—and finally in the dwellings of the just).' That is to say, those friends you have made (from mammon) in business, at the works, at tennis, or what not, through being not too exclusive, will turn to you and receive your teaching and respect your opinion about the things that matter (eternal truth, reality): and so there will be a 'communion of saints' both here and hereafter.

In short, the Jewish Church had failed, Mammon fails; but just where they fail Christ succeeds.

This reopening of a much-debated question in an attempt to reinforce one of those interpretations that have been made before has respected Dr. Stier's warning. No attempt has been made to unravel the many complications of commentators. If Dr. Kirk's four interpretations have been, to some extent, modified or re-focussed, nevertheless a word of thanks is due to him for having provided the impetus at a psychological moment. Should there be any validity in the point here suggested, it would seem to reinforce the position (on p. 121) in his latest book.

Finally, would it not be better to speak of the parable as that of 'The Untrustworthy Steward' rather than as that of 'The Unjust or Unrighteous Steward'?

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Thorn that Blossomed.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

'Instead of the thorn.'—Is 55^{13}.

An old legend tells us that Joseph of Arimathea sailed on the seas to England long ago, bearing the cup that Jesus used at the Last Supper. When he came to Glastonbury, he and his company rested, for they were tired, at the top of a long hill called 'Weary-all Hill.' There he struck his thorn staff into the ground, and it took root, and there sprang from it a white thorn tree, which every Christmas day miraculously burst into blossom.

Now there *was* a white thorn at Glastonbury for

many a day; and it *did* blossom with a second blossoming at Christmas-time; but whether it came from Joseph's staff, I don't know, and I don't propose to ask.

But there is truth in this old story, and it is a truth of Christmas Day. Long ago God's ancient people was just like a lopped and withered stick. Its branches had been stripped and cut away. Its pride was brought very low. Winter had come upon it and it seemed quite dead.

But a prophet dreamed that 'out of the lopped stump of Jesse' there should come a shoot, and a twig out of the battered root; and at long last the dream came true.

On Christmas Day at Bethlehem the shrivelled-up stump of the nation of David burst into bloom, and the blossom was Jesus Christ our Lord. It did not seem likely. It was as strange and wonderful as a thorn tree blossoming in mid-winter; but 'the winter of our discontent' was 'made glorious summer' by the sun of God's love. Though Mary belonged to the family of David, she was the wife of a humble carpenter of Nazareth; yet her Son was our Saviour. He was the beautiful and pure white bloom.

The story of the thorn at Glastonbury is just a poetical way of saying 'Christ was born at Bethlehem,' and poetry is just as true as history.

And it is also the story of what happens every year as Christmas comes round. Human nature is the thorn, and it is sometimes a very prickly thorn indeed. The battle of life batters it and makes it hard and nubbly. The cold winds of the world shrivel up its leaves of kindness and break down its tender gentlenesses. It seems sometimes as if it were dead and hopeless, as if it could only bear thorns and things that wound and pierce and tear, wars and strifes and disputes.

Then comes Christmas and the old thorn bursts into blossom. It blooms in kindness and goodwill to men. People that all the rest of the year have passed each other unheeding, not knowing each other, not wanting to know each other, scrambling against each other in trains and buses, hustling against each other in business, now beam good nature on each other and wish each other 'A Merry Christmas'! People, that for the rest of the year are too dignified to carry parcels, are seen with great awkward armfuls and quite happy about it; and when they go into train or tram with them, people who at other times would scowl at them for cluttering up the carriage and crowding folk with their parcels, smile and grow kinder, wondering what is in them and thinking of the children whose happiness is done up so in brown paper. Stiff bachelor uncles and severe maiden aunts, who at other times look as if they had forgotten that they had ever been children, seem suddenly to have remembered and thawed. They are seen unashamed and very interested buying dolls! They are seen absorbed and chuckling over clockwork toys. They even leave business to attend to these things, and late at night, before they have sent them away, I quite believe they play with them themselves!

Grave old folk pull crackers and wear paper caps. Quite old folk—people about thirty and forty years old!—even hang up their stockings! What a jolly time it is! What has happened to the world? Why, just this: the thorn tree has blossomed again on Christmas Day.

Once the same old prophet, that dreamed of the dead stump blossoming, looked out on a troubled world and saw men like beasts; greedy as lions, treacherous as wolves, poisonous as serpents; and he had another dream. He dreamed that some day all those brutishnesses of man's nature would be changed and 'a little child should lead them.'

That too is coming, slowly. Jesus is leading us slowly but surely out of the things that made for war and its savage struggles to a better way. Some day the thorny human heart will bear the wonderful blossom of peace on earth.

Girls and boys, I wish you a Happy Christmas in the name of the Lord Jesus who gave us Christmas. 'Instead of the thorn' of selfishness which makes our lives so prickly and unkind, may there blossom anew in your hearts the wonderful flower of love.

What do you Measure by?

By the Reverend Ernest G. Loosley, B.D., Altrincham.

'Be ye . . . even as your Father is.'—Lk 6[36].

Of course we must have *something* to measure by. There is no sense in saying that a thing is as big as a bit of wood, or as long as a piece of string; for a bit of wood may be of any size and a piece of string of any length. We must have a *standard*—something fixed and definite with which we can compare anything that we want to measure. In a certain wall at Greenwich Observatory a metal rod has been placed which is exactly a yard long, and which is so made that it does not become longer on a hot day or shorter on a cold day, as most metals do. If you want to be very exact, you can take anything you want to measure all the way to Greenwich, and compare it with that metal rod. But we do not often need to be so exact as that,

and for all ordinary purposes the tape measure or the foot rule that you can buy in any town will be accurate enough.

Long before men used the yard standard, they measured everything by themselves. This was the easiest and most natural way for them to describe the size of anything. We have just spoken of a foot rule. It has to be a large 'foot' to measure twelve inches, but of course that is how the foot measurement began—a thing was a foot long when it was about the length of a man's foot. We still measure the height of horses by 'hands,' the hand being four inches, that is, about the width of the palm of the hand. In the Old Testament you often read about 'cubits.' A cubit was the length of the forearm, from the elbow to the tip of the middle finger. The Hebrews also measured by 'finger-breadths' and 'spans'; and instead of repeating their 'table of measure' as you do—'twelve inches one foot, three feet one yard'—they had to learn something like this:

4 finger-breadths (digits) = 1 palm.
3 palms = 1 span.
2 spans = 1 cubit.

In various European countries cloth and other goods used to be measured by the 'ell,' which comes from the Latin *ulna*, meaning elbow or arm. An ell was usually the length of an arm, but sometimes it meant the full reach of the extended arms, and so it varied from twenty-seven to fifty-four inches. It was like 'foot' and 'hand' and the Hebrew 'cubit' in this respect, that it was based on a part of the human body.

You can easily see one disadvantage in taking parts of our bodies as standards to measure by. We are not all the same size. Even amongst grown-up people, some are very tall and some very short, and there are all sizes in between. The hands of some are so small that they cannot span an octave on the piano, while others have no difficulty in spanning a full octave and two notes of the next. Which is to be the agreed 'span'? That was the difficulty, and for a time people solved it by saying that the king should be the standard size, and that the 'ell' should be the length of the king's arm. But only for a time: for the next king might be several sizes larger or smaller.

Rather more than a hundred years ago, some Frenchmen saw how unsatisfactory the whole method was, and decided to start afresh on an altogether different basis. They said, 'We won't measure things by ourselves or by parts of our own bodies any longer. We will measure by the earth, which is always the same, and then there will be no doubt about it.' So they took the measurement of the earth from the Equator to the North Pole, and divided it by ten million; and that fraction of the earth's measurement they called a 'metre.' It is a little more than our 'yard'—just over thirty-nine inches; and upon that one measure the whole system of their weights and measures is based. It is so much more satisfactory than any other system that scientists all over the world have adopted it; and probably many of you learn it at school in addition to our own.

Really it is not satisfactory to measure things by ourselves or by one another. When you hear a boy saying, 'Well, I'm as good as *he* is, anyway,' you feel that there is something wrong about his way of measuring himself, even if you cannot see at once what is the right way. To compare ourselves with other people, and feel satisfied if we are no worse than they are, and proud if we are a little bit better—that is taking an unsatisfactory standard, and one that will not help us to grow. Jesus gives us a much better one. It is as startling as the change made by the Frenchmen when they left the stupid little standard of a man's body, and jumped right to the circumference of the earth. 'Measure yourself by God,' says Jesus. If you want to know how big you are, compare yourself with God. If you want to measure your character, put it side by side with God's. If you want to know how good you ought to be, look at God. 'Be ye merciful, even as your father is merciful.' 'Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly father is perfect.' Don't be satisfied with forgiving your brother seven times: forgive him seventy times seven, as God forgives.

If you measure yourself by God, you will never be proud or 'stuck-up,' and that will be a good thing. But though you will always feel that you have nothing to be conceited about, actually you will grow bigger and better than if you measured yourself by others. For the higher the standard, the better the result is likely to be; and the best can only be attained by aiming at the highest.

The Christian Year.

Third Sunday in Advent.

The Reign of Christ.

'For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet.'—1 Co 15^{25}.

'Thy kingdom come.'—Lk 11^{2}.

What a marvellous foresight it was in Christ which anticipated the spirit and temper of a Church

that should say, 'My lord delayeth his coming!' It is a very long time since Christ came; and it seems to us likely enough that it will be still longer before He comes again. For most of us Advent hopes are blurred and dim. We have lost the eagerness of men who are looking for their Lord. It was natural and necessary that men who stood so near to the Son of Man in the flesh should find it impossible to face the future without the hope of seeing Him again on earth. But that is not for us. We must re-conceive and re-interpret Advent; and that Christ shall come again must mean to us something different from what it meant in the days of the Apostles.

Let us look at two of the certainties which Advent proclaims, the permanent and changeless message of which the shocks and shifting movements of thought can never rob us.

1. There is the fact of the final triumph, the ultimate supremacy of Jesus Christ. Look at St. Paul's great statement of this, the climax to which all the close-knit witness of his magnificent apology for the Resurrection leads. 'He must reign.' With unflinching confidence he rests his conclusion upon the immovable rock of the Easter message, 'Christ is risen.' The Resurrection was a revolution, a transvaluation of all values, as the philosopher would say. It was also a revelation—a revelation of immortality; but above all it was a revelation of Christ Himself, for He had entered into His glory, and since 'it was not possible that he should be holden of death,' the reign of sin was broken by the victory of love. So His supreme place in the Universe and His external Kingship over men stand revealed. There can be no repetition of Calvary. The end of the campaign can tarry but a little; 'He must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet.' Advent flows out of Easter, as summer flows from spring.

There is one question which no thoughtful man can decline to face. Nietzsche asked it, as he moulded before the startled eyes of the nineteenth century the monstrous portent of his Superman—'Who is to be the Master of the world?' What is the future of this strange world in which we live our lives, so full of inveterate contradictions and alternating hopes and fears? Whither are we tending? What is to be the end?

It is hard not to be overwhelmed by the forebodings which whisper that life is a meaningless and purposeless drama being played out to a bitter end. And yet, in spite of it all, the instinct of hope burns on within us, and we will not, cannot, let it die. Man's dignity lies in this, his defiance of appearance. In some way or other in every life Pippa passes. The Pippa-song goes on singing, above the funeral dirges and the monodies of defeat and dereliction, because man seeks a Saviour, and in the sanctuary of his spirit there is a vacant throne made ready for his King. The King has come, and the King is coming! The secret of the eternally attractive power of the Christian message is that it speaks as nothing else does to that instinct of hope. To our heaving, dissatisfied age, with the world in ferment, to the restless and baffled individual heart, to the mind staggered with insoluble problems, it comes with its redemptive tidings, 'He must reign, till he hath put all his enemies under his feet.' This is the first great certainty, and it brings with it both warning and hope. The fear of Advent—how little we know of it! Yet there needs no laboured proof to convince an awakened conscience of the folly of a life that refuses to yield to the claims of the coming King. That is the solemn warning, lest we be found fighting against God. But to the warning is added glorious hope. 'Our citizenship is in heaven; from whence also we wait for a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ: who shall fashion anew the body of our humiliation, that it may be conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself.'

2. Let us pass on now to think of the light of Advent certainty which falls upon the present. What do we mean when we say, 'Thy kingdom come'?

The strength of the first Christians was their strong hold upon the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the Resurrection on the one hand, and an ever-imminent Advent on the other. In the first-century manual, known as the *Didaché*, or *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, there is a Eucharistic prayer to be used after reception in the Holy Communion, which runs thus: 'Remember, O Lord, thy church, to deliver her from all evil, and to perfect her in thy love, and gather her together from the four winds, her which is sanctified unto thy kingdom which thou didst prepare for her. . . . Let grace come and this world pass away. Hosanna to the God of David! If any is holy, let him come; if any is not, let him repent. Maran atha—our Lord cometh! Amen.' Thus every Eucharist was shot through and through with the glory of the return of Jesus. 'Our father, which art in heaven, thy kingdom come.' Like the Church of the *Didaché*, the Church in the twentieth century may say this still, and with the same meaning. To Christian faith Jesus Christ is always imminent. But the

teaching of the Lord's Parables warns us that we must not unduly limit its reference to the one thought, however true, and the one reality, however imminent. For the Kingdom of which Christ speaks comes also slowly and gradually, like the growth of the seed from its earliest state when it is cast into the earth, till it becomes the waving mustard plant in which the birds of the air take shelter. We cannot think of the Kingdom without thinking ultimately of its completeness; we cannot pray for its growth without praying that it may become full-grown. And therefore the Advent of Christ in His Kingdom, of which the Parable of the Mustard Seed and others like it speak, is one which is always on the way to completion; it is the beginning of, and the drawing on towards, the end. But none the less here and now it is actually taking place; it is going on; it is moving forward.

Sure of the end and looking forward to Christ's final victory, where can we trace His coming into our midst to-day?

(1) For answer we will point first to two facts—really one and indivisible—the fact of the Church and the fact of individual Christian experience. Perhaps these things seem too commonplace to be of real value; we are so accustomed to acknowledge them that we miss their vital significance. But it is just this 'rejuvenescence of commonplace' which we need most of all in our vision of things, that we may see them truly.

Nineteen hundred years after His death Jesus Christ reigns to-day in millions of human lives. Consider that fact! Not only the phenomenon of a society reaching to the ends of the earth, which with all its defects and shortcomings is still the most potent spiritual and moral force that exists among men. That in itself is arresting and wonderful. But the supreme marvel about it is the experience of which that society is the collective expression. For every member of Christ's Church, far more even than he articulately knows, lives by Christ Himself, as Way, as Truth, as Life. The Christian experience of Christ is the most astonishing fact in the spiritual history of mankind.

(2) Look out, secondly, into this great modern world, and see how Christ is preparing a way that He may pass anew into its life. Is it not plain that He is coming into it by creating a void for Himself, that the sense of that void may prove to it that it has need of Him? He has been doing that on a great scale these last fifty years, and He is still doing it now.

There is a threefold cry resounding in the world to-day. First, a cry for the spiritual. As Rudolf Eucken is never weary of telling us, with all its brilliant achievements in external and material things the world is hungry and thirsty still, and eager for a message that will feed the spirit. A cry, next, for the living God; for a God who neither is His own world, nor is imprisoned within it, helpless and unable to break through the barriers of laws which are the expression of His own will, a God who is mighty to save. A cry, last, for human brotherhood, uttered through all our industrial unrest, and only to be answered by man's elder brother Christ, and the family relationships which He came to reveal under the one God and Father of us all. And here in the midst of our stormy debates, our cynical and disappointed scepticism, our blind and broken quests, there stands One among us whom we know not, the living Christ with His ancient answer to every human cry, spoken for none more than for us twentieth-century men and women who so profoundly need it, 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.'

It would be easy to add to all this the witness of the advent of the Kingdom in other ways, such as the new sense of obligation with which men are facing social problems, and more especially the changed attitude to Christianity in other lands whose opening doors are yielding entrance to the coming of the Son of Man. The world is not won for Christ; but never in the whole of its history has it stood so ready for Him, and offered so many avenues of approach to its King. Who that has eyes to see but can descry the coming of the Kingdom in the progress which the Church has made in the awakening East? We must not omit to follow now the great pathways of light which are breaking through into the distant places of the earth like the far-flung beams of the rising sun. Here is Advent certainty—the fact of a coming of the Kingdom—to confirm the patience and to inspire the hope of a Church which ever looks and hastens unto the end.[1]

Fourth Sunday in Advent.

Judgment.

'So then every one of us shall give account of himself to God.'—Ro 14^{12}.

'I am responsible for my life.' 'I am moving rapidly onwards to a great moment of account-giving for that stewardship, on which my eternal destiny hangs.' These are two tremendous doc-

[1] F. B. Macnutt, *Advent Certainties*, 3.

trines, which, in their simple forms, have taken profound hold of the religious mind. These have bit deep in men's consciousness; and even yet hold a more powerful sway over men's minds than at times we think.

But we do not phrase them precisely as we did. We see that qualifications of a very grave kind need to be introduced into the doctrine of responsibility; and we realize that the great matter of judgment to come is presented to us in Scripture in language of a 'littleness to suit man's faculty.' We realize that judgment is taking place continually, as our characters turn either to evil or to God.

The danger is that the great, underlying thoughts shall be weakened, with disastrous results to morality. These two thoughts are: *We are responsible.* How much or how little is of no concern. The point is that we are responsible. *We are responsible to God.* Whether the setting of the rendering of our accounts shall be that of a law court or not is of no account. The point is that we are responsible to the living God, who knows, and sees, and understands, and judges.

1. Let us be clear that these two positions are maintained by us, and that, whatever phrasing we give them, they do not lose their force. In the first place, we are responsible for our lives. In this matter we have to allow for the influence of heredity and for the influence of environment. Many a time we must agree with Christina Rossetti, when, to a judgment affixing blame, she puts a caveat:

> Clearly his own fault. Yet I think
> My fault in part, who did not pray
> But lagged and would not lead the way,
> . . . . . .
> God help us both to mend and pray.

But there are two ways of approaching the matter from the point of view of the individual in question. We can say that we are not free, but are a part of all the scoundrels we have met. Wherefore, then, should we struggle? We are not to blame. Thus we may let the fact of our being bound in the bundle of life be an excuse for doing nice things that are wrong. On the other hand, we may say we are curiously hampered by a long dead past; yet we are so far free. Our consciousness, our reason, the universal consciousness, which awards praise and blame to individuals for their action, tell us that we are free. We will therefore concentrate our minds on our freedom and not on our bonds. We will err on the side of exaggerating our responsibility rather than of minimizing it. We will strive to fulfil rightly such responsibility for ourselves as God has given us.

We shall remember that the doctrine of the effect which we have on one another is to be regarded as an impetus to action, rather than a reason for handing over the reins to our appetites. Why? Because we, according to that teaching, are affecting the moral possibilities of those that come after us. Therefore, at any cost, we will stand up and live.

Let us remember also that the statement of our bonds may be overdone. Let it be granted that we are nervous, naturally indolent, and love excitement. Must we therefore be irritable, do no work, and come home drunk at nights? Why, we have forgotten our *will*. We can struggle against these things. That is what we are for. Ah! but our will is feeble. Then we have forgotten God's grace and His spirit. Remembering these, we shall not only watch and work and strive, but we shall also pray.

2. Briefly, in the second place, note that we are responsible *to God*. We must render an account to Him. This very awful matter of the rendering of a final account to the Most High is one on which we can have little to say, except that it is a fact. The Scriptures portray it to us, pictorially indeed, but with a dignity and a greatness that must still the most frivolous of readers.

It is to *God* that we have to give account. Men are not measured by an absolute standard. It is not with the law that we are compared. The law would reject the weak who had struggled up a little. God judges the world with equity. Let that be for comfort and for warning. It is the use made of endowment that will test us; not the absolute amount of service rendered. It is God—a *Mind*—with whom we have to do.

Further, in other passages of Scripture, it is Christ who is stated to be the Judge. That is to say, it is immortal Love before whom man comes. Let that be for comfort also; and for warning still more. Let a man shut his eyes and anticipate, as he can, that scene. Jesus, the True, the Gracious, with eyes that scorch and burn—before Him we come. There, in Him, is what human life may be and has been. Here are we; and His contrast judges us. His Love judges us. Ah! the shame:

> I plead Thyself with Thee, I plead
> Thee in our utter need;
> Lord God of mercy and of men,
> Show mercy on us then.

Meantime, claim simply His forgiveness—for it is given—and with Him leave the past. Then, 'under the Great Task-Master's eye,' stand up and live as men who have to die, and, what is more, have to live for ever.[1]

CHRISTMAS DAY.

The Spirit of Expectation.

'This is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us.'—Is 25^9.

1. The special note of the season of Advent is *expectation.* We are trained in the habit of looking forward that we may come to Christmas-time with the spirit of expectation in our hearts. For this spirit of expectation is like a golden thread, linking together the children of God of all times. It was the master-instinct of the prophets. They moved through the world of their day with something of the far-off look of men who have trained themselves to look forward. And gradually their vision came to concentrate on one thing—the promise of the coming of Christ. 'We have waited for him.' The Old Testament is the record of how men waited for the Incarnation, how they kept alive the spirit of expectation in the midst of discouragement and long delay. And so, when the promise was fulfilled, it was to men who had learned to wait that the truth was revealed, to shepherds who kept watch by night, to wise men who waited for His star, to Simeon and Anna who were looking for the consolation of Israel. But still the spirit of expectation lived on. Ask the early Christians what they are doing, and the reply is still the same: 'We are waiting for him.' And still the unconquerable spirit of expectation lives in human hearts. Still men wait and dream of a good to come.

For success, and love, and honour? And then? For wealth, perhaps, and fame? And then? Is it only death at the end? Or is the true answer the answer of our text—we are waiting for God, for the touch of the Divine hand, the light of the Divine face, the realization of the vision of God? Keep this spirit of expectation, and we keep the secret of courage and hope; lose it, and life is like a coloured window behind which the sunset has faded, leaving only the darkened framework of the picture that glowed with splendid colours a little while ago.

2. Christmas is a season of expectation. And then also it is a season of *confidence.* 'He will save us.' How the idea of salvation runs through all the Christmas story. 'Unto you is born a *Saviour.*' 'Mine eyes have seen thy salvation.' 'He will save us'—that is what Christmas comes to tell us again. Not—He will save the heathen, the outcast, the hopeless; but He will save *us.* It is a personal confession. For it implies that we are dissatisfied with our lives as they are; that we are willing that they should be lifted out of the bondage of convention, the slavery of selfishness and greed, the deception thoughtlessly practised, the slander carelessly spoken. We confess that we too have need of salvation. And we confess that the power of the incarnate Christ is adequate to our needs.

No one can mix much with his fellow-men without realizing that a new doubt is everywhere awaking in men's minds. Is not Christianity an exhausted force? Is not its power over the world coming to an end? Here are vast social evils crying to heaven, and no salvation comes. Men live and work and die with no apparent consciousness of spiritual realities, and all our efforts break against the passive force of apathy.

Can we, in face of all this, still hold to our belief that He who was born on that first Christmas morning is the Saviour of the world? If He is a Saviour, where is His salvation? If He is a King, where is that kingdom for whose coming we have prayed? We must face questions like these, and they will lead us back to the cradle of Bethlehem. We believe that in the Incarnation lies still the hope of the world. Yes, and our hope too. For when the simple truths of religion have become complicated by human glosses, and have lost touch with reality, or have grown hard and intolerant, we need to bring them again to Bethlehem and lay them at the cradle of a little Child. For He is the Saviour of Christianity as well as the Saviour of the world. Of our religious ideas, as well as of our personal character, it is true that except we be converted and become as little children, we cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.

3. And lastly, Christmas is a season of *realization.* 'This is our God.' The Jewish records told how the people had stood at the foot of a great mountain and seen its summit shaken with earthquake and encircled with flame; and as they watched they whispered: 'This — splendid, terrifying, isolated—this is our God.' But the hour came when awed faces of simple men looked down on the cradle of a little Child, and whispered: 'This is our God'; no longer separated, encircled with majesty, but veiled in flesh, humbled to the

[1] J. R. P. Sclater, *The Enterprise of Life,* 305.

fashion of men, entering human life through the avenue of birth. Is it strange that from that moment a revolution began in human thought of which no man can see the end?

And now another Christmas comes to tell us how the lost romance of the world came back when Jesus was born at Bethlehem of Judæa in the days of Herod the King. For a creed that tells how God was found in a cradle and on a cross ought surely to train us in the habit of watching for God where we should least expect to find Him. 'This is our God'; we have marked His footsteps along the fields, we have heard His voice among the trees. But, most of all, we have learned to look for Him in the broken bread and the poured-out wine. For still the wonder of that first Christmas Day renews itself in simple hearts:

> And they who do their souls no wrong,
> But keep at eve the faith of morn,
> Shall daily hear the angel-song,
> 'To-day the Prince of Peace is born!'

There can be no true peace till the spirit of distrust and greed and selfish ambition ceases to dominate the policy of nations. The only real guarantee for peace is in the resolute and watchful action of all Christian men. In this, too, 'He will save us,' if we wait for Him. For He will save us from the impulse that makes for war, He will give us strength to stand firm when the passions of men break loose in the clamour for blood; He will teach us that there are better battles to fight than the battles full of 'confused noise and garments rolled in blood.' *His* battle is against ignorance and vice, against the selfish heart and the grasping hand, against discord and hatred, and all the foul things that haunt the darkness. So we pray: 'Give peace in our time, O Lord,' not that we may rest in indolent ease, but that we may turn to the true task of the patriot—the battle against vice and drink and sweating and ignorance; the truceless battle that must not end till we can join the triumph song: 'This is our God; we have waited for him, and he *has saved us*.'[1]

New Year's Day.

Running to a Finish.

'I count not myself to have apprehended.'—Ph 3^{13}.

To the man who adopts this attitude everything in the way of achievement is possible. It is the forward look with high resolve. It is the will keyed to conquest. Such a mood forecasts the years, overleaps all obstacles, and already holds the future in fee. It has no further use for the past than it has for last year's calendar. It is something to forget, and the sooner the better. Whatever the past has registered, either of failure or success, can be dismissed without loss; because to dwell on success will breed complacency, and to brood over failure will beget distrust, both of which are sworn foes to the onward march of both mind and morals.

To count oneself to have apprehended or achieved is at once to relax effort; and to relax effort is to lose ground. Hence the pressing towards the mark of which the Apostle speaks in the context. Pressure means resistance, and the gradient of the upward way is a perpetual challenge to our powers. Life must be geared for the climb. Paul had seen many a race lost through overconfidence on the part of the runner, and in this heavenly race he is resolved to relax no effort, but to strain every power to the utmost till his hand shall close on the coveted prize. Not the way that he has come, but the distance he has yet to go, fills his eye, absorbs his thought, and summons all his powers.

Paul knew, as few men get to know, the value of a great and heroic past. But he also knew that the whole of that value would be neutralized unless it was carried forward and made available for present and future use. Anything in a man's past that cannot thus be carried forward with advantage, and be made to serve his interests by making its contribution to the great ends of life, had best be forgotten. Hence he says, 'Forgetting the things that are behind.' Like the rest of us, Paul had a past which was sadly mixed; and he felt that, for the sake of present and all-round efficiency, it was best to turn his back completely upon it and face only the future. The past is out of hand.

He 'counted.' This is a familiar phrase of Paul's. He figured things out. His conduct was not a flash in the pan, ignited by the impact of some sudden impulse and then dying out in smoke. It was the calmly reasoned conviction of his mind after taking all things into account. Looking at things as they were, and comparing them with what they ought to have been, he concluded that he had not yet achieved, but had still a long way to go. What a rebuke to the self-complacency of those who are sitting down in contented mediocrity, is the mood of this divinely discontented soul! He is still in the struggle, amid all the heat

[1] J. H. B. Masterman, *The Challenge of Christ*, 91.

and dust and sweat of conflict, with an awful sense of interval between the actual end and the ideal, between himself and the goal toward which he speeds. Such a testimony from such a man should serve as a fine corrective to the self-satisfaction which is drugging so many of us into idle and effortless ways. To be satisfied is to cut the nerve of all lofty and sustained endeavour, and to slip back inevitably among the degenerates and inefficients. It is so everywhere—in business, in art, in science, in letters, in religion.

No business firm, no nation, no church can live on its past. Once we regard ourselves as having achieved, we put ourselves out of the running. We straightway become a negligible quantity and cease to count. But to hold our own and win through has its price. Here, too, Paul is our example. Here again he 'counted,' figuring the cost of Christianity, and what it would mean to break with all the traditions and associations of the past, and he calmly gives us the result. 'What things were gain to me, those I counted loss for Christ. Yea, doubtless, and I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Jesus Christ, for whom I have suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but refuse that I may win Christ.'

Regarding the Christian race as the pursuit of the ideal righteousness both for ourselves and others, it must be remembered that, just as the Olympic contests had their rigorous rules, to depart from which was to be disqualified, so is it in the contest for the moral mastery. There are conditions stringently enjoined, for even a right end must not be sought by doubtful or illicit means. It is difficult, of course, at this distance of time, to ascertain all the rules and regulations which controlled the games of ancient times. But that some of them must have suggested to Paul certain great analogies which would occur to his readers, is all the clearer from the fact that they are not stated but simply implied. There is a phrase in the letter to the Hebrews, 'the race that is set before us,' which implies that the course is 'laid down,' marked out, that is, as to its direction and its distance, together with all the conditions of preparation and pursuit. Every candidate in the Olympic games was obliged to prove that he had put in ten months' training before his nomination and to put in another month before the event. This corresponds with the 'laying aside of every weight,' which really means to get rid of all superfluous flesh. Then again, we read how runners, with soul triumphant over the body, strained onward, heedless of failing heart and limb—on to the goal; so that a victor was even known to drop dead as he received the crown. This answers to the word 'patience,' or 'staying power,' as it may be rendered. It is also clear from the accounts that have come down to us, that every candidate was required to run in his own name, or find himself disqualified. Here, at least, is one point of analogy in the matter of unlawful running which may very well have been present to the Apostle's mind. He that would enter for the Christian race must do so in a perfectly frank and open manner. He must declare himself; for to run this race secretly or anonymously will be to be counted out as unworthy at the finish. But nothing is commoner than to hear men say that they see so much profession without the practice that they prefer to practise without making profession. The fear of hypocrisy in one direction thus drives them to hypocrisy in another; for the man who is endeavouring to lead a godly life while pretending to be a man of the world is as truly a hypocrite as the man who is living a worldly life while posing as a man of God. Christ has laid down as an absolute condition of discipleship a perfectly frank avowal on the part of His followers of their having entered the lists in His name. 'He that confesses me before men, him will I confess before my father in heaven.'

Having then counted the cost, let us, like Paul, strip ourselves for the strife, counting no hardness too severe to endure, and no sacrifice too great to make, if we may but win through to the goal, and by running to a finish make sure of the coveted crown.[1]

[1] H. Howard, *The Love that Lifts*, 31.

The Origin of the Book of Job.

By Judah J. Slotki, B.A., Manchester.

From the mass of controversial literature on the origin of the Book of Job, a point of agreement that emerges most clearly is that, when reading the book, we seem to soar into an atmosphere quite foreign to the generality of Old Testament books.[1] 'Inter omnes Sacri Codicis monumenta exstare quodammodo mihi videtur Liber Jobi, quasi singulare quoddam atque unicarum.'[2] Its style varies from the other books of the Hebrew Canon in two important points: (1) in the combination of poetry and prose, and (2) in the use of dialogue.

These peculiarities have been explained in two ways: (1) the book is said to be a borrowed work, a translation or adaptation; (2) the writer, though composing an original work, is assumed to have been influenced by foreign literature. Both these theories have, as might be expected, been vigorously upheld and as hotly contested among the highest authorities. Some scholars detect Babylonian influence,[3] but the 'philosophical dialogue' of the Babylonians, so far as yet known, differs so very widely from the dialogue of *Job*, that it is considered unjustifiable to assume any direct influence of the one over the other.[4] A recent scholar[5] makes a very able attempt to prove its Egyptian origin. But by far the greatest number of scholars look to Greece for the source and inspiration of the work, and, according to Oscar Holtzmann (Stade's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. 340–52), the book can be accounted for only by postulating the influence of Greek thought.[6] Gray admits[7] that the most famous examples of Greek dialogue were written at probably no great distance of time from Job, and Dr. Kallen[8] even attempts to prove that *Job* was definitely written as an imitation or echo by a Hebrew genius of a Euripidean tragedy, and that our present work is the result of editorial interpolation and disarrangement.[9]

It is surely, then, not mere superficial resemblance that has turned the eyes of an ever-increasing number of scholars to Greek literature for an explanation of the peculiarities of the Book of Job.

That Jews and Greeks were for centuries associated with each other in the various pursuits of life is not seriously disputed by any one. With the conquests of Alexander in Asia they were brought together in the comradeship and rivalries of endless campaigns, Judea was surrounded by a host of Greek communities, and her people was drawn into residence and citizenship all over the Greek world.[10] In Egypt they came in contact with Greek traders who had been settled on the *Delta* since 700 B.C.E., and with Greek soldiers who had been enlisted by Psametik about 600 B.C.E. In Babylon they met Greeks who had held positions at the court and in the army since the days of Nebuchadnezzar (604–561 B.C.E.). Through the Phœnicians they became acquainted with many Greek lands and peoples,[11] of whom even Joel (*c.* 400 B.C.E.) had already heard.[12]

It will therefore be readily admitted that Greek literature was most probably accessible to the Jewish *literati*, who would no doubt read it, for even in Talmudic times Greek was favourably regarded among Jews, and Rabban Gamaliel himself studied Greek. That the Jewish writers should be influenced by this literature is no matter for wonder, for among Greek writers there were such as had much in common with the Hebrew Prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.E.[13] So much so that it has even been maintained that there had been Semitic influence upon Greece as early as the time of Homer in the eleventh century B.C.E.

A mass of evidence goes to support the theory that *Job* was not written before *c.* 350 B.C.E., probably much later[14]. This brings the writer

[1] Cf. Ball, *The Book of Job*, p. 1.
[2] Lowth, *de Sacri Poes. Hebr. Prael.*, p. xxxii.
[3] Cf. Hastings, *D.B.* single vol. p. 472.
[4] Cf. Gray, *Job* (I.C.C.), p. xxiv.
[5] Frank Knight, *Nile and Jordan.*
[6] Cf. Peake, 'Job,' *Century Bible*, p. 40.
[7] *Op. cit.* p. xxii.
[8] *Job as a Euripidean Tragedy.*
[9] Cf. Montefiore, *Harvard Theological Review*, April 1919, p. 219.
[10] Cf. G. A. Smith, *Jerusalem*, p. 369.
[11] *Op. cit.* p. 368.
[12] Joel iii. 6.
[13] Cf. Campbell, *Tragic Dramas in Æschylus*, p. 155.
[14] This is not incompatible with orthodox Jewish opinion, for the Talmud (Baba Bathra 14^b 15^a) records a denial of the historicity of the book, and is, moreover, supported by the theory of Rabbis Jochanan and Elazar, who hold that Job was among the returned exiles.

of *Job* well within the Greek period. So that on *a priori* grounds we may expect him to have been among those Jewish writers who had had the opportunity of reading Greek.

Now, whether or not the author of the Book of Job had read many or all of the Greek classics, cannot here be discussed. What appears, however, to the present writer at least, to bear a high degree of probability, is that he had read, and had been inspired by, the *Prometheus Bound* of Æschylus.

The affinity of *Job* with the *Prometheus* has already long been more or less clearly realized by some scholars. Alexander Gordon[1] plainly describes Job as 'the Prometheus who boldly joins issue with the Almighty, against whom he girds himself for his Titanic contests.' This is no mere figure of speech. No one comparing the two books can fail to be impressed by the numerous similarities of thought, and more especially by the identity of the points of discussion in both books. The very names in the Book of Job, sounding so strange to the Hebrew ear, show traces of the influence of the *Prometheus*.

But particularly striking are the numerous passages that are practically identical, and the many more that are closely similar, while others are strongly suggestive of each other in the two books.

The following comparison of collated passages will bear out these statements :

I. Passages practically Identical :[2]

Prometheus Bound.	*Job.*
The pillar of heaven (p. 69).	The pillars of heaven (xxvi. 11).
The dart of Zeus (p. 69).	The arrows of the Almighty (vi. 4).
A bad physician (p. 75).	Physicians of no value (xiii. 4).
Enough the weary wanderings (p. 83).	I am full of tossings to and fro (vii. 4).
What was the sin that thou didst find in me ? (p. 81).	Wherein have I erred ? (vi. 24).
Time as it groweth old doth all things teach (p. 105).	Days would speak, and multitude of years should teach wisdom (xxxii. 7).
All have I foreseen (p. 103).	The thing which I feared is come (iii. 25 *marg.*).
I transgressed deliberately (p. 65).	Be it indeed that I have erred (xix. 4).
Do you not see that you did wrong ? (p. 63).	Is not thy wickedness great ? neither is there any end to thine iniquities (xxii. 5).
You have lost heart (p. 75).	It is come unto thee, and thou faintest; it toucheth thee, and thou art troubled (iv. 5).
Would that . . . he had hurled me . . . in . . . Tartarus (p. 57).	Would that thou hadst hidden me in *Sheol* (xiv. 13).

II. Passages very similar in Expression :

He has set me high in the winds of heaven (p. 58).	Thou liftest me up to the wind (xxx. 22).
(The monster) smitten in the very seat of sense, his strength was blasted and beaten out of him (p. 69).	By his understanding he smiteth through Rahab (xxvi. 12).
I wish to offer you the best advice (p. 67).	Receive, I pray thee, instruction from his mouth, and lay up his words in thine heart (xxii. 22).
The gore-fed eagle . . . shall come unbidden to a daily feast (p. 107).	The eagle that swoopeth upon the prey (ix. 26).
Solemn forsooth and garnished well with pride (p. 103).	Deck thyself with excellency and dignity (xl. 10).

[1] *Poets of the Old Testament*, p. 205.

[2] References are to Harman, *Prometheus Bound of Æschylus*, and to R.V.

III. Passages similar in Thought:

Prometheus Bound.	*Job.*
Daring art thou . . . to words at will thou givest thy tongue the rein (p. 59).	How long wilt thou speak these things? and how long shall the words of thy mouth be like a mighty wind? (viii. 2).
Of wretched mortals he (Zeus) took no account at all (p. 63).	Men groan from out of the city, and the soul of the wounded crieth out: yet God giveth no heed [See *Cambridge Bible* note] (xxiv. 12).
It is easy for one who has his foot out of harm's way to exhort and admonish another who is in trouble (p. 65).	I also could speak as ye do: if your soul were in my soul's stead (xvi. 4).
I have good hope that you will yet get free from these bonds and be no whit less powerful than Zeus (p. 77).	Though thy beginning was small, yet thy latter end should greatly increase (viii. 7).
The mouth divine knows not to lie, but every word fulfils (p. 109).	Doth God pervert judgment? Or doth the Almighty pervert justice? (viii. 3).
To his will he bows the heavenly race (p. 59).	Dominion and fear are with him; he maketh peace in his high places (xxv. 2).
For this brief hour let him do and reign even as he will; not long he'll rule the gods (p. 103).	The triumphing of the wicked is short, and the joy of the godless but for a moment (xx. 5).
Dismiss those angry feelings and seek some way out of these troubles (p. 67).	If iniquity be in thine hand, put it far away (xi. 14).

IV. Passages which, though not Identical, are very similar both in Thought and Phraseology:

That fell monster . . . with grim jaws breathing forth death and horror of lightning from his eyes (p. 69).	Out of his mouth go burning torches, and sparks of fire leap forth; out of his nostrils a smoke goeth (xli. 19, 20).
Burn me with fire, or hide me in the earth, or to monsters of ocean cast me a prey—nay, in mercy refuse not, O king, my beseeching (p. 83).	Oh, that I might have my request; and that God would grant me the thing that I pray for! Even that it would please God to crush me; that he would let loose his hand, and cut me off! (vi. 8, 9).
Words thick and troubled dash against surges of dreadful affliction (p. 99). Painful are these things to tell (p. 61).	I will speak in the anguish of my spirit; I will complain in the bitterness of my soul (vii. 11).
Ill in silence and yet ill in speech, this fate of mine! (p. 55).	Though I speak, my grief is not assuaged: and though I forbear, what am I eased? (xvi. 6).
Consent, I beg you, consent; show sympathy with the one who is in trouble now (p. 65).	Have pity upon me, have pity upon me, O ye my friends; for the hand of God hath touched me (xix. 21).
To my . . . chamber kept coming nightly visions (p. 86). By dreams . . . was I nightly made wretched (p. 86).	Thou scarest me with dreams, and terrifiest me through visions (vii. 14).
I saved mankind from being destroyed (p. 63). Lend your ears to what I did for mortals, how before, suffering and witless I on them bestowed mind and an understanding; for seeing then, they saw in vain; hearing they heeded not; but all their actions, like to shapes in dreams, were still at random with governance (p. 75). O, benefactor uprisen for mankind (p. 83).	I delivered the poor that cried, the fatherless also, that had none to help him (xxix. 12). I was eyes to the blind, and feet was I to the lame (xxix. 15). Thou hast strengthened the weak hands. Thy words have upholden him that was falling, and thou hast confirmed the feeble knees (iv. 3, 4). The blessing of him that was ready to perish came upon me; and I caused the widow's heart to sing for joy (xxix. 13).
The thunderbolt with breath of flame (p. 69).	The thunder of his mighty deeds (xxvi. 14).

V. Finally, we meet with Passages in one Book which are strikingly suggestive of Passages in the Other:

Prometheus Bound.	*Job.*
The wise are they who homage yield to Fate (p. 103).	The fear of the Lord, that is wisdom (xxviii. 28).
O light of heaven divine, fleet airs, Fountains of rivers, laughter of many waves, Innumerable of the sea, Earth, great mother, And thou all-seeing Sun, on you I call (p. 54).	Let the day perish wherein I was born, and the night which said, There is a man child conceived [1] (iii. 3).
And then, those benefits to mankind, which lay concealed beneath the earth, brass, iron, silver, gold, who can claim to have discovered them before me? (p. 77).	Surely there is a place for silver, and a place for gold which they refine. Iron is taken out of the earth, and brass is molten out of the stone (xxviii. 1, 2).

It is evident that all these similarities cannot be due to mere accident, and that they are so numerous that they must point to a real interdependence. The author of *Job* seems, from all that has been said, to have made a careful study of the *Prometheus Bound*. The play he was studying breathed the Jewish spirit and could not but produce a profound impression on him. It dealt with the great problem of justice between man and God, with world justice. What more natural than that he, a man 'of superb genius, of rich daring and original mind'[2] should be inspired by this brilliant achievement of a Greek soldier, and, his mind still full of the thoughts and expressions of the *Prometheus Bound*, he should be impelled to take a flight of his own?

His own ideals, drawn from the spiritual fountains of the Hebrew nation, lifted him infinitely higher than the highest altitudes reached by his Hellenistic predecessor, and there he gave birth to 'the most splendid creation of Hebrew Poetry,'[3] to the greatest poem the world has yet produced.

[1] Both heroes call on the elements in affliction.

[2] J. E. McFadyen, *An Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 264.

[3] *Ency. Brit.*, art. 'Job.'

Praise in the Religious Life.[4]

By the Reverend Lewis Tucker, M.A., Bowdon.

I had a stimulating conversation, a few months ago, with a minister who had maintained a progressive pulpit for a long period. He was emphatic about one thing, and that was, that worshipping congregations and ministers leading the devotions ought to be concerned chiefly with praise to God. We have no right to come into the sanctuary like cringing curs into the presence of a tyrant of uncertain temper. A Christianity which is full of fear is not only afraid of life but afraid of God, on the assumption that His actions are not predictable, and that there is no security in Him.

If Christianity is natural it is exuberant and eager to express its gratitude. It ought not to be difficult to find a doxology.

1. We are prone to overlook the fact that praise and thanksgiving are helps to the spiritual life. By them we realize that our God 'daily loadeth us with benefits.' Our faith in His present redemptive Fatherhood is strengthened and our souls gain quality and tone. Too much of our time is spent complaining. We fret ourselves into sourspiritedness and waste our time fretting when difficulties come. No one can expect to escape difficulty. Our troubles are real enough. But life is not helped by grumbling. The reactions of a fretful spirit are helplessness and incompetence in the presence of a situation which calls for faith and energy. God's goodness does not cease to operate

[4] An address given at the Presbyterian Retreat, Westminster College, Cambridge, 20th September 1927.

when the sun goes down. There is a speech in the stars, and a song in the night. And though our immediate difficulties be dark as midnight, even then, remembering the stability of God's ways, we can give thanks.

2. The Puritans, men who knew poverty, scourging, and bonds for the gospel's sake, used to praise God in their darkest experiences, for, in their quaint phrase, they affirmed that 'praise and faith live and die together.' And they were not far wrong when you look at it. We usually associate praise with memory and make it link the present to the past. We stand in the strength of providential mercies. It is He who hath made us and not we ourselves. We give thanks for memories of the great goodness of God. We think of faith as linking the present to the future. Things yet to be substantiated are looked for on the ground of what we have now in our possession. The Christian sacrifice of thanksgiving ought to keep in vital alliance praise and faith, binding into a real unity past, present, and future. We can render thanks for mercies yet to come because we have already received mercy. Christian gratitude is certainly a lively sense of favours to come. As a matter of fact, past and present are pledges of the future. Further gifts are linked to one gift. That is the religious significance of Sir Arthur Keith's address on Darwinism. The gift of life, at the beginning a simple cell, has in it the further gifts of variety of form and activity. Where more highly organized life is given, further gifts of food and raiment are implied. Where the mind is given, further gifts of truth, goodness, and beauty to satisfy the needs of the mind are implied. To a race seeking satisfactions of this kind, Christ is given, God-given, and with Him is given the pledge of the ultimate triumph of the Kingdom of God. As the Divine Spirit triumphed in the body of Jesus over sin and death, so shall that Spirit triumph in the body politic and commercial throughout the world. Even now there are movements as dramatic in their significance as the fact that the Crucified Christ captured the throne of Cæsar within four centuries from Calvary. Skilled observers tell us that in the East, in India especially, Jesus is capturing the imagination and shaping the ideals of great masses of people. The recent speeches of Gandhi and the 'Christ of the Indian Road' alike bear witness to it. We hear of the break-up of Islam and the success of the message, 'There is no God but God, and Jesus is the express image of His person.'

In Persia during the last thirty years there have been amazing developments of Christianity among all classes of society. I believe that the ferment of revolution and of social unrest in Asia and in Europe, and indeed in all the continents, is, from one point of view, the working of the leaven of ideas of brotherhood and justice which have been directly derived from the Christian gospel. We live in the days of international judgment, and we are finding that in the interplay of opinions and in the conflict of criticism ideas of progressive humanity are born. The Kingdom of God is coming—here a little, there a little:

> Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
> Comes silent, flooding in, the main.

The certainty of the ultimate triumph of the Divine Spirit is implied and pledged in the triumph of the Spirit in the body of Jesus. The important thing is not the exact hour when the event predicted will happen, but the certainty that it shall come to pass and shall not fail. To human judgment it may seem to be thousands of years ahead in the dim centuries of the far future. But faith visualizes the end and the triumph as though they were actual now, and praises God for the mercy which invests all the affairs of the present time with the tremendous interests of the last day.

3. There is an idea, frequently met with in the Psalms, which modern Christians have not yet fully appreciated. Praise is 'comely'—a delight, not a duty. There are compulsions in the manifoldness of God's bounty which make praise a necessity. But praise is not only right, it is a pleasure which makes worship and the worshipping soul 'pleasant.'

> Praise ye the Lord; for it is good,
> praise to our God to sing:
> For it is pleasant, and to praise
> it is a comely thing.

There is not only joy in the reverent courtesy which recognizes the 'loving wisdom of our God,' but there is the added blessing of an enriched soul. The truth is seen in the story of the Cleansing of the Ten Lepers. They left Jesus, having faith in His word, but with the marks of their disease still upon them, to submit themselves to the priest to be tested for leprosy. Their faith must have been a very real thing. As they went they were healed. One went back, when he saw the change, to render thanks. The others were caught up in the excitement of the new opportunity which their faith had won for them. But they lacked the grace of gratitude, and something died in their souls

though their bodies were healed. The other gave the first part of his new life, a part that could have been given to eager renewals of the life from which a leper had been excluded, as a sacrifice of thanksgiving for the miracle of the road. He brought the immediate joy and interests of a cleansed leper into renewed contact with the Jesus of the authoritative word, and he was enriched above the others. The urbane Jesus gave him wholeness of soul.

A soul is made comely by gratitude. There is a blight upon the ungrateful life. Though it has faith, it becomes warped and sere when it lacks the beauty and pleasantness of praise.

A cynic could sum up our general behaviour as always asking, always receiving, always forgetting. It should be as artistic and courtly as a well-set hymn. Not flattery—we cannot flatter God—but praise enriches life. I heard a Quaker break the silence of family worship with this sentence: 'O Lord, Thy world is so full of benedictions that there is no need for us to pray—only to praise.' A prayer offered by a blacksmith in my old church expressed all the quality of praise, and anticipated all its rich reactions, when he spoke of our thanksgiving going up to God drawn by His mercy as the sun sucks moisture from the earth which will fall again upon the world as rain to keep it alive. He saw that the soul thrives when it responds to the pull of God's goodness. His mercy is from everlasting to everlasting; it is evident in the unfoldings of time; it holds the future when the Divine Spirit shall triumph in history. Let us give thanks. How is it to be done? Hear the words of a great Christian teacher and try to realize what they mean: 'I beseech you, therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a sacrifice of thanksgiving, holy, well pleasing to God, which is your logical and spiritual service.'

Contributions and Comments.

The 'Servant.'

In Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson's book, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, there is a valuable appended Note in which he discusses the views of Professor Burkitt on the references to the Servant passages of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament. Professor Burkitt is of opinion that 'the application of Is 53 as a prediction of the passion of Jesus was the work of Gentile Christians familiar only with the Bible in Greek.' He points out that such references are frequent in Acts, Matthew, 1 Peter, and Hebrews (the authors of which are all users of the Septuagint), but are scarcely to be found at all in Paul, 'John,' and the Apocalyptist. He further suggests that the reason for this is that the LXX has softened the *ebed* (lit. 'slave') of the Hebrew into παῖς, by which the idea of servitude is not necessarily implied. He suggests that Paul, who read his Bible in Hebrew, would scarcely like to use *ebed*, 'slave' of Christ.

Dr. Rawlinson very appositely counters all this by reference to the well-attested fact that, in Semitic lands, kings constantly called themselves the slave of their god, and adopted names such as Abd-Ba'al, Abd-Osir, etc., in which the word 'slave' is a part. This quite disposes of the necessity for assuming that the Servant passages must first have been applied to Christ by readers of the LXX. But it does not explain why Paul should make such small use of Is 53. Dr. Rawlinson suggests as the explanation of this that Paul 'was affected not by Hebrew but by *Greek* social ideas about slavery.'

It is curious that both Burkitt and Rawlinson seem in this discussion[1] to have forgotten the fact that Paul is the one New Testament writer who does use the word 'slave' (δοῦλος) of Christ. It seems to me that Ph 2 completely disposes of Professor Burkitt's case. Is it possible that Paul had the 'servant' passages in mind when writing this, and that the words 'He emptied himself, taking the form of a slave' (ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν μορφὴν δοῦλου λαβών) were intended to signify 'he took upon himself the rôle of the servant in Is 53'? Verbal similarities between this passage and Is 53 are lacking, but the tone and thought of both are the same—the servant, humiliation, death, and the value of it all. 'He shall see of the travail of his soul and shall be satisfied' may well stand as the prophetic adumbration of the great fact which Paul refers to in the words, 'Wherefore also God highly exalted him,' etc.

[1] Dr. Rawlinson does suggest in another place (p. 135, footnote 3) that Ph 2 may be an allusion to *ebed* Jahweh of Deutero-Isaiah.

If Is 53 was in Paul's mind, was not the connecting link his knowledge of our Lord's words, 'The son of man came not to be served, but to serve, and to give his life a ransom for many'? Here the word 'slave' does not occur, but it stands in the immediately preceding sentence. The ideal for the disciple is to be 'slave of all,' and the example of the Master is adduced to drive the lesson home. Does it not seem very likely that in the actual words Jesus used of Himself the idea of slave-service was conveyed, and the reporters softened it into the διακονῆσαι of our Gospels? Thus we come back to the time-honoured view that it was our Lord Himself who first applied Is 53 to His own work.

The question still remains why Paul uses this passage so little. May not the answer lie along the line of the marked difference between the idea of fulfilment of prophecy held by the ordinary run of Christians from at least the time of Matthew and Acts till to-day, and Paul's much deeper and sounder idea of the Old Testament preparing us for Christ? His attitude to the matter does not require the 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet.' He was concerned to show rather that Christ did what law and prophets failed to do. That occasionally he does use the old fulfilment method is true, but it was not necessary to his fundamental line of argument.

W. E. Wilson.

Woodbrooke, Birmingham.

The Voice out of the Whirlwind.

Apropos of the thoughts about the voice out of the whirlwind expressed in The Expository Times of July 1927, page 439, the following passage is interesting. It is the closing passage of F. W. Robertson's sermon, *Realizing the Second Advent*, Series I. No. 10.

> 'This is the blessing of affliction to those who will lie still and not struggle in a cowardly or a resentful way. It is God speaking to Job out of the whirlwind, and saying—In the sunshine and the warmth you cannot meet Me: but in the hurricane and the darkness, when wave after wave has swept down and across the soul, you shall see My Form, and hear My Voice, and know that your Redeemer liveth.'

Geo. L. Hurst.

Quebec.

The Four Anointings

(Matt. xxvi. 6–13; Mark xiv. 3–9; Luke vii. 36–50; John xii. 1–11).

Variation in writing stories is permissible and natural. This is apparent in the writings of one author; it is true also when many authors attempt to relate one incident or event. Not every man sees the same meaning in an experience. It is not possible to have uniformity in expression. Moreover, a story that has a setting in antiquity reveals, in the course of time, a tendency to be changed. Those who have the duty of handing down to posterity such a story may be guilty of changing the text or substance. It is also possible that as stories gain in retelling so may they gain when rewritten. The age of myth, legend, and fancies is a prolific source of exaggerated expression. Additions to original stories and sayings may be expected in such an age.

In the four incidents of our survey we have other possibilities. Theological conceptions, preconceived ideas, and accepted doctrines may have been reasons in the mind of the scribe or copyist for changing the meaning of the text. There are, therefore, general problems to be met before the incidents of the four anointings can be discussed separately. Are our stories the related experiences of eye-witnesses? Do they contain additions to the text? Can we discover any sign of abbreviation in the stories? Are there any indications of the incidents being recounted to suit accepted opinions?

In Mt 26^{6-13} we seem to have an historical setting of the incident. Bethany is mentioned as the place of the event. The house of Simon the Leper is also mentioned. Apparently the truth of this setting cannot be questioned. Mk 14^{3} is in agreement with these facts. Luke does not mention the place, and refers to 'a Pharisee,' not Simon the Leper, as the host of our Lord. This causes us to ask whether or not we can identify Simon the Leper with the Pharisee. St. John's Gospel, on the other hand, whilst mentioning Bethany, suggests that our Lord had Supper in the house of Mary and Martha. St. John's account shows a decided variation from the other three accounts. The correct account can only be decided by evidence or opinion.

As the story proceeds in St. Matthew's Gospel one is stimulated to ask questions. The difficulty lies in the matter of anointing the head. This appears to have been done. But we have no clue in this account of Matthew as to why an anointing of the feet could not have taken place. Mark is in agreement with Matthew. Luke and John mention

the anointing of the feet. We have to decide on the greater probability—the anointing of the head or feet. It is well worth noting that in Matthew and Mark the words put into the mouth of our Lord refer to the anointing of the body, the head not being specifically mentioned. In St. Luke mention is made by our Lord of the anointing of His feet, whereas in John no mention of the anointing of the feet or body is made by Him. The remainder of the narrative of Matthew is in agreement with Mark, but Luke's application of the story is different. St. John's account is obviously abbreviated.

The incident of Mk 14^{3-9} is in entire agreement with St. Matthew's account. The disagreements of Luke and John with Matthew obtain also with Mark.

The reader of St. Luke's account finds that there is a different concern in that narrative compared with the other three writers. Apart from the fact that in this incident no place is mentioned and that the person referred to is not named, we notice the absence of the criticism of the disciples about the waste involved in the anointing. The discussion in this account ranges around the woman and Jesus. The statement that the woman is a sinner and that of our Lord's ignorance of the woman, combined with the criticism of Simon by Jesus, takes the place of the idea of waste involved in the anointing. We cannot escape the feeling, however, that here we have a story told quite naturally and without strain. We have a conversation which can be readily understood and which is most likely to be true when the principles of religious concern of our Lord's generation are known. And, again, we may observe how easily our Lord makes a transition from the fact of anointing by the woman who is a sinner to the great principles of love and forgiveness. The introduction of the Parable of the Two Debtors seems also a natural part of the conversation. In this connexion the problem arises as to why the Parable, seemingly so important to the teaching of forgiveness, is not referred to in the accounts of Matthew, Mark, and John.

The rebuking of the Pharisee also makes the account of the woman and her doings a striking antithesis, and hence enhances the probability of it being true. Then again, the anointing of the feet gains credence because of its naturalness. We should expect the woman who was a sinner to anoint the feet rather than the head. It must be acknowledged, however, that in Luke's account we have no reference to the anointing of the body before burial. On the whole, then, the incident by Luke seems the most independent. It is the only one which does not mention the 'cry of waste' by Judas, and the only account having the Parable of the Debtors with the subsequent teaching on forgiveness. Moreover, the rebuke to the Pharisee is unique.

St. John 12^{1-6} mentions the place of the incident as Bethany. Neither Simon the Leper nor 'the Pharisee' is mentioned. The home, apparently, is that of Lazarus. The woman who anoints Jesus is Mary, and evidently distinct from the woman of disreputable character. The anointing here takes the nature of a dedication of a great love, and seems distinct from the idea of the need of forgiveness. The feet are anointed; the head is not anointed. We also have the argument of waste and an expression of concern for the poor by Judas. There is no reference to the anointing of the body before burial.

In the four accounts we have likenesses and differences. Luke's account is most unlike any of the other three accounts, and hence, unless the accounts of Matthew, Mark, and John come from a previous original source, it seems the most likely of the four.

The opinion now offered is that the four stories are variants of two original accounts, or are the outcome of a misplacement of facts. One account underlies Luke and that part of John which refers to the anointing of the feet; the other incident is that which underlies Matthew, Mark, and that part of John which relates to the 'waste' idea of Judas. We therefore construct two stories.

The first anointing is by the woman of disreputable character, happening at a time distinct from that of the anointing mentioned by Mark. This woman anoints the feet. The scene is in Simon's home at Bethany. Here our Lord found an opportunity of teaching the lesson of love and forgiveness, and also of rebuking the artificial religionist, Simon. The second anointing is by Mary the sister of Martha and Lazarus. This scene is in their own home at Bethany. Mary anoints our Lord's head. This is likely to be true on account of the familiarity that existed between Mary and Jesus. The 'waste' idea of Judas seems to have a fitting context here. All the people in the house were known to each other. We can now understand the ready criticism offered by Judas. It was hardly likely that such a criticism would have been offered at the anointing by the woman who was a sinner. It seems more fitting for the expression of reverent love by Mary to evoke the

words of our Lord in reference to His burial, than the act of the woman who was a sinner.

T. W. Bevan.

Rotherham.

1 Corinthians xi. 10.

The variant MS. readings and transpositions of this verse seem to point to some unsoundness in the text (if not to interpolation, as v.[11] follows naturally upon v.[9], and the sequence of thought is broken by v.[10]): διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους.

One of the difficulties of the text is the phrase, ἐξουσίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς. R.V. margin, 'to have authority over her head,' is a plain and straightforward rendering, but obscure in meaning. To take it as connoting that the woman is to keep her head in subjection, by wearing a veil or hood upon it, seems very forced. Adopting a MS. reading, οὐκ ὀφείλει, quite a good meaning is obtained, 'the woman ought not to have authority over the head' (*i.e.* the man; cf. v.[2] *sup.*). But that obviously from the context is not Paul's meaning. The rendering (A.V., R.V.) of ἐξουσίαν as 'a sign of authority' receives no support from N.T. usage, where the word invariably means simply 'power,' 'authority.' Conybeare and Howson, *in loc.* (*Life and Epistles of St. Paul*), translate ἐξουσίαν, 'a sign of subjection,' quoting in support Lk 7[8]. The correct rendering there appears, however, to be, 'For I, also, am a man appointed under authority (a centurion, by those having authority so to appoint), having soldiers under me.' The centurion compares his own position to that of our Lord who has been appointed 'under authority' to expel at a word disease, even as he himself at a word to his men can enforce his will.

The great crux of the passage lies in the phrase, διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους. That angels were present at meetings for public worship, and would be offended at the presence of unveiled women, as the phrase is generally interpreted, is alien to N.T. writings (the 'Angels of the Churches' in the Apocalypse are obviously no parallel); and that they exercise any influence or authority over worshippers is foreign to Paul's thought, who set himself sternly against the angelolatry which even in his day was beginning to show itself within the Church. Further, Paul settles the matter in question by saying (v.[16]), 'But if any man seemeth to be contentious (over this matter), we (I) have no such custom, neither the churches of God.' It is a matter of custom, says the Apostle. Why, then, should he appeal to the angels? From the context we learn that Paul has just said (v.[7]), 'the woman's part is to manifest her husband's glory,' *i.e.* she has his 'honour' in her keeping, and should accordingly avoid whatever might lead to any shadow being cast on that 'honour.' The Apostle has passed for the moment from the particular to the general (returning to the former v.[13] *ss.*). 'Woman,' as the 'glory' of her husband, should by no action, however seemingly trivial, do ought that tended to obscure that 'glory.' We might, therefore, expect Paul to indicate here (v.[10]) how (*e.g.* by covering her head) she might help in securing that object.

Accordingly I would read from MSS. either, διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξιοῦσα ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοὺς ὄχλους, 'The woman, when proceeding out of doors, should have (a covering, τι [understood]) on her head on account of the crowd; or, διὰ τοῦτο ὀφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ἐξουβίαν ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς διὰ τοὺς ἀγέλους, 'The woman ought to have a covering (mantle) upon her head on account of the crowd.' Against this latter is the strange word, ἐξουβίαν, which might perhaps be an adopted word (Lat. *exuvis* [a mantle], *exuviae*) among the Corinthians. The Vulgate, *velamen*, would seem to imply that a word connoting 'a covering' of some sort was in the text before the translator.

In a city so notorious for its laxity of morals as Corinth (cf. classical writers, *passim*) it would certainly have been at least judicious for Christian women not to go out of doors unveiled, so as not to expose themselves to insult.

For ἀγγέλους, it may be noted, J. B. Köhler reads διαβόλους, which, owing to a misreading of its meaning here (enemies, detractors), may have caused the substitution of ἀγγέλους.[1]

W. D. Morris.

Kelso.

[1] For the variant MS. readings I am indebted to Theile's revision of Knapp's edition of the N.T.

'Tears shall take Comfort.'

A STUDY OF PSALMS XLII., XLIII.

By the Reverend R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc., Cambuslang.

The Psalms for the most part have no decipherable signature. They have to be taken as they stand, a precious legacy handed down by the strange invention of writing out of a forgotten past. In some few cases, however, and one is the Psalm divided into two and numbered 42 and 43 in the English Bible, enough information can be gleaned to kindle an interest in the ancient author and his times.

Looking not down on the print, but away eastward across the world and back through the mists of centuries, the eye of the imagination lights on a figure distinctly visible. He goes wearily on foot, chained by the neck, one of a long line of captives trudging northward in the heat on a dusty Syrian road:

going mournfully under the oppression of the enemy.

He wears a long priestly robe, ragged and dirty. He is young, so that the pace that is killing the weaklings is easy enough for him. Many eyes are dull and dazed, but he still glances around and often backwards. Tethered as he is, his hands are free, and in one, hidden in a tattered fold of his garment, he clutches a little tablet which he takes out furtively from time to time, and scratches with the point of a thorn. Some soldiers ride past and, meeting his glance, fling at him a mocking jest. His figure stiffens with resentment, and then as he scowls after them it relaxes, and out comes the tablet, and he jots down:

My tears have been my meat day and night,
While they say unto me continually, Where is thy God?

He looks back along the line and a bitter smile flits across his face. Once again his fingers pinch the thorn and he sets down:

I went once, I remember, at the head of a throng,
With joy and praise to the house of God.

The way is long and the road rises, and sometimes at the top of a hill or at a turn there is a little halt. With one accord the captives look wistfully toward the familiar landmarks left behind in the dim distance, and as this man gazes the tablet is pulled forth and the name of the place is noted, the last view of Jordan, and Hermon, and Mizar, and then the sobbing words:

All thy waves and thy billows are gone over me.

The Psalm lies there in cold print. But the ear can fancy that it catches the music sounding faint and mellow across the gulf of twenty-five hundred years. Whence comes that thin far-off wail? These Jewish prisoners are far now from their own land. They dare not leave the track in the middle of the waterless desert, so there is no need to rope them together now. The jottings on the tablet have grown and taken form during the monotonous marches, and by moonlight he has worked them into shape. At last one night as he and some comrades lie huddled in the lee of a tamarisk bush, talking of home and vanished days, and wondering if ever they will return, this young priest speaks shyly, 'Listen! I have made a song of all this and it goes to the tune "Suffering," or to that other tune "Dove of isles afar." Here it is.' Eager heads cluster round the little tablet, closely packed with writing now, and when for the third time the singer reaches the refrain:

Why art thou cast down, O my soul?
And why art thou disquieted in me?

all are joining in the chorus. Up to the stars it floated, and still it lingers in the air, one of the imperishable songs of faith.

How was the song preserved? When the band of exiles arrived in Babylon, was the little tablet still safe? or were the words now graven on the memory of many, already become familiar and dear on many a weary march, and round many a camp-fire? Did the poet live to know that this psalm was adopted into the sacred collection? Did he return as he hoped, and listen to his own song chanted in stately music by the Temple choir? Or did he learn, as his countrymen did, to let his religious affections entwine themselves round a Holy Book instead of a Holy Place, and find the words tuneful to his spirit as he set his face towards some humble synagogue in a foreign land? Did he prepare his soul for its weekly worship there by singing with a spiritual meaning, as men do to-day:

O send thy light forth and thy truth,
Let them be guides to me?

Who can say? Yet plainly this is a captives' song, written on the long trek, and sung first beneath the stars. Sorrow is in it, humiliation and dismay,

the hard struggle for faith when mocking Babylonians asked where was Jehovah. But the beginning is not the language of despair :

> Like as the hart panteth after the water-springs,
> So panteth my soul after thee, O God.
> My soul thirsteth for the living God.

No agony or ache can break or master his spirit, and he ends on the note of triumphant assurance :

> Hope thou in God : for I shall yet praise him, my helper, my God.

For nine hundred years this psalm has been used by the Christian Church as a sacramental psalm. In the Missal it forms part of the 'preparation of the priest.' What is it that makes it particularly appropriate to the Communion service ? It certainly covers a wide range of religious experience ; it begins with high aspiration after God, then, descending, moves through the depths of doubt and anguish, and finally rises again to the heights of faith. But why not at the Table of the Lord dwell simply on the amazing love of God and the certainty of our redemption ?

The reason is that it is possible to be too matter-of-fact and casual in the approach to the mystery of the gospel ; to become so accustomed to the splendour of God's grace as to take it for granted, as a careless lad may take for granted all a mother's care and never notice the sacrifice in it. The idea in using this psalm is that at the Lord's Table any depths that are in a man ought to be stirred. To appreciate the gospel rightly one must imagine what the situation would be without the gospel. At the best it would be that of this psalmist, with dismay in his heart, and doubt besetting him, but with his hope indomitable, and his yearning after grace untasted yet. And as one current of electricity induces another when it is brought near a dead wire, so the larger utterances of fear and penitence and hope stir deeper thoughts in shallow minds and create an understanding of the inward conflict that is a true mark of the religious life. The double movement, toward despair as well as hope, produces a heightened tension, more sorrow, more yearning, more expectation. 'Thou liftedst me up that I might see,' says Augustine, 'and I perceived myself to be far off from Thee.'

> So all night long the trouble grew,
> Whereby I knew there would be born a star.

To begin the sacramental act away back at the Old Testament stage of religion and enter into this earlier experience of doubt and struggle is a way of preparing the soul to rejoice with a right wonder and gratitude that all the days of misgiving are over.

> O send thy light forth and thy truth.

Nay, but the Light of the world is shining :

> Why art thou cast down, O my soul ?

Yea, why ? The Lord's guests are to have, not the mingled emotions of the captive, but the gladness of those who have arrived late, yet found the door wide open and the table spread.

Entre Nous.

'The Expository Times' for 1928.

Besides the usual features and the usual articles on varied subjects, we have arranged a series of articles on Personalities of special interest to theologians. Each article will be written by some one who has had close personal contact with the subject of it. The series will include Deissmann, Barth, Schweitzer, Carl Heim, Harnack, Söderblom, and others, and amongst the contributors will be Professor H. R. Mackintosh, Professor Curtis, and Principal W. B. Selbie. A short series of articles on 'Commentaries to the Old and New Testaments' is to be contributed by Dr. Peake, and Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson will write on 'Recent Lives of Christ.' The Sermon on the Mount will be dealt with in successive articles, and still another series will reply to the question, What is the Gospel ? —the Gospel for Africa, for China, and for India.

The Impatience of a Parson.

The Impatience of a Parson is Mr. H. R. L. Sheppard's plea for the recovery of vital Christianity (Hodder & Stoughton ; 3s. 6d. net). Perhaps we might criticise the form of the book, the repetitions that occur in it, and other things. We might say that it is provocative. But would it not fail in its end if it were not provocative ? 'I want a disturb-

ance,' says Mr. Sheppard frankly. 'I want almost anything rather than an unchallenged continuation of these smothered institutional versions of the fire which Jesus Christ came to cast upon the earth.' It is doubtful if we could even spare the repetitions, for they make the book easy reading—though hard enough in another sense—and this is a book which will be read, not by a small number of ecclesiastics and theologians, but by thousands of ordinary men and women.

Mr. Sheppard's is a great vision, the vision of a united Church showing forth in its corporate life the fullness of Christ's teaching. His soul longs for the Anglican communion, his own dearly loved Church, to lead the way. In order that it may do so, he suggests a programme for the next Lambeth Conference and fills a chapter with constructive suggestions.

But instead of going into these, let us rather look at Mr. Sheppard's foundations. He has three foundation stones. He says, first, that a Church may not be corporately less Christian than the Christian individual. 'I shall declare my belief that no Church can be actually Christian that corporately expresses values which differ from the outstanding values of Christ, and which would be repudiated by an individual disciple for his own life and practice as being less than Christlike. Obvious and fundamental as this axiom may appear, it is not one which the Churches have attended to in the past.' His second foundation stone is that the Christian Institution is essential. 'A Church of some sort is necessary, not only because Jesus Christ seemed to take one for granted, but because He appeared to wish His followers to be associated together in a fellowship. "There is nothing," writes Bishop Gore, "more central to the mind of Christ than that you can only love God in fellowship." Moreover, group organization is a necessity for mankind, and the spiritual needs of the majority will not be catered for without a society, through which men may express their ideals, and from which they may obtain that which they require to keep them strong and steadfast in the way. As long as man is man Churches will be needed for all that moral and spiritual re-enforcement which common life and aims and example and worship and symbolism can give.'

But though the Christian Institution is essential, Mr. Sheppard goes on to say, in the third place, that it is subsidiary to the adventure of Christian living. 'While I recognize the absolute necessity for the Christian Society, I believe that its main purpose and function is to serve and encourage those who have determined within their own souls to dare the Way of Christ, and have started or are starting on that venture. *The Church, however essential, is subsidiary to the adventure of Christian living*—just as to our Lord the Church of His day was subsidiary to the Kingdom of God, that condition of living in which Love prevails.'

H. R. L. Sheppard speaks.

Consciousness of Sin

'It may be true that the modern man is not worrying about his sins, yet I fancy he is frequently worried about his own moral futility and strange inability to carry through the good resolutions of the night before—surely much the same thing.[1]

Profession and Achievement

'I wonder how we must appear to those who watch us and hear us making our brave assertions about the Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and our personal devotion to the Lord Christ. I wonder if we do not seem to them like Alpine climbers who, having greased their faces and covered them with masks, and having put on their nailed boots and taken ice-axes in their hands, then proceed to walk gravely up the mild heights of Ludgate Hill? The contrast between our profession and our achievement would be ludicrous if it were not so utterly pathetic.'[2]

War

'We cannot any more think of war as anything but a damnable arrest of development and decency; it is not only the willingness to suffer agony, it is the willingness to inflict it. War cannot be reconciled with Christianity: there is no such thing as a Christian war. . . . They [professing Christians] are ready to kill members of other nations if the Government of the day bids them do so. It is true that they think civil war a terrible thing, but if all men are brethren is there in the mind of Christ a distinction between an Englishman killing an Englishman and an Englishman killing a Chinaman?'[3]

Christianity too Heavy

'We live our Christianity too heavily. I know no better way of expressing what I mean than by the words which were spoken by an old lady at the poor end of a parish, who said she did not want the

[1] P. 57. [2] P. 146. [3] Pp. 52, 141.

church-worker coming round saving her soul on her.' [1]

Fellowship

'Think of the churches and chapels that we know intimately, and then say which of them gives to an ordinary wayfarer, even to one who is seeking for a Saviour, any encouragement to persevere, and any impression that here for the seeking is the satisfaction of his soul's hunger? Which of them conveys to ordinary people the sense of a living fellowship one with another in Christ and of vital human concern for their neighbours' welfare? I am afraid there is often more real fellowship in the public-house than in the Christian Church.' [2]

One Church

'Not until there is a Church like some great cathedral in which there are a multitude of side-chapels where the one God is worshipped in different ways by differently minded people, and yet all are within the One Church, is there any hope of Christianity prevailing. Not until the values of Christ and the Spirit of Christ are accepted by Christian people as the one unifying centre around which all loyalties are grouped can we talk of offering our world the Christian religion. If the spiritual eyes of my Communion were once opened, I fancy it might make a great offering to this ideal.' [3]

Material Things.

'Yesterday I came upon the following passage in an Essay by Bagehot. "Mr. O. has a story of some deputation of Indians, at which the American Orator harangued the barbarian audience about 'the Great Spirit,' and 'the land of their fathers,' in the style of Fenimore Cooper's novels; during a moment's pause in the great stream, an old Indian asked the deputation: 'Why does your chief speak thus to us? We did not wish great instruction or fine words; we desire brandy and tobacco.'"

'Why did I think of you when I laughed over this? Because no one would better appreciate the humour and the pathos of it all, and its relation to states of mind and modes of thought that you and I have met with.'

The quotation is from a letter of Mr. F. W. Macdonald to Dr. W. L. Watkinson. Dr. Watkinson died in 1925 at the age of eighty-six. Mr. Macdonald still 'watches life through the window of old age.' They were lifelong friends, and, during the last years, when they could no longer meet, they wrote constantly to each other of books, of current affairs, and of how they felt on the deep things of life. Both were in the Wesleyan Methodist ministry. Dr. Watkinson was President of Conference in 1897, and was known to a wider public by his published sermons and addresses. Mr. Macdonald had a long ancestry in the Church—his grandfather having been ordained by Wesley. His father was George Browne Macdonald, also a Wesleyan minister. It will be remembered that three of his sisters married Poynter, Burne-Jones, and Baldwin. A footnote to one of the letters says, 'You would see that another sister's son, Sir Ambrose Macdonald Poynter, died the other day after a surgical operation. It supplies a pathetic contrast to his cousin Baldwin's honours.' This is a little book to be enjoyed in a restful moment. The title is *The Letters of Two Friends* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net).

[1] P. 145. [2] P. 183. [3] P. 197.

Two Prayers.

The Student Christian Movement has done a real service in publishing in this country Dr. Walter Rauschenbusch's *Prayers of the Social Awakening* (3s. net). We have a rich equipment from the past for the culture of individual religion, but how few prayers express the religious emotions of social Christianity. Dr. Rauschenbusch meets this need.

The Author's Prayer.

O Thou who art the light of my soul, I thank Thee for the incomparable joy of listening to Thy voice within, and I know that no word of Thine shall return void, however brokenly uttered. If aught in this book was said through lack of knowledge, or through weakness of faith in Thee or of love for men, I pray Thee to overrule my sin and turn aside its force before it harm Thy cause. Pardon the frailty of Thy servant, and look upon him only as he sinks his life in Jesus, his Master and Saviour. Amen.

For the Kingdom of God.

O Christ, Thou hast bidden us pray for the coming of Thy Father's Kingdom, in which His righteous will shall be done on earth. We have treasured Thy words, but we have forgotten their meaning, and Thy great hope has grown dim in Thy Church. We bless Thee for the inspired souls of all ages who

saw afar the shining city of God, and by faith left the profit of the present to follow their vision. We rejoice that to-day the hope of these lonely hearts is becoming the clear faith of millions. Help us, O Lord, in the courage of faith to seize what has now come so near, that the glad day of God may dawn at last. As we have mastered Nature that we might gain wealth, help us now to master the social relations of mankind that we may gain justice and a world of brothers. For what shall it profit our nation if it gain numbers and riches, and lose the sense of the living God and the joy of human brotherhood?

Make us determined to live by truth and not by lies, to found our common life on the eternal foundations of righteousness and love, and no longer to prop the tottering house of wrong by legalized cruelty and force. Help us to make the welfare of all the supreme law of our land, that so our commonwealth may be built strong and secure on the love of all its citizens. Cast down the throne of Mammon who ever grinds the life of men, and set up Thy throne, O Christ, for Thou didst die that men might live. Show Thy erring children at last the way from the City of Destruction to the City of Love, and fulfil the longings of the prophets of humanity. Our Master, once more we make Thy faith our prayer: 'Thy kingdom come! Thy will be done on earth!'

NEW POETRY.

Thomas Moult.

Six years ago Mr. Moult had the happy idea of publishing an anthology of the verse which had appeared during the year in newspapers and magazines. We now have the sixth consecutive survey—*The Best Poems of 1927* (Cape; 6s. net). The collection has a twofold value. It preserves verse which might otherwise be lost sight of, and by its comprehensiveness—there are over seventy poets represented—it affords a good idea of the matter and style of the most recent poetry. We choose for quotation Louis Golding on narrow nationalism, and Clement Wood's 'The Green Christs':

Wanderers' Dust.

My father lies in Doomington,
The dark city of Doomington,
  And there my mother died.
By this chance and that chance
My brother died in green France
  With a wound in his side.

My father's mother by the Don
Sleeps there near her small son,
  But that land was not theirs.
The river thrusts its snout by
Fields of maize four metres high
  And the lone lank firs.

My father's father's father sleeps
Under the burnt Caucasian steeps,
  Whom the Turk there led.
But for my mother's mother's line
I must fare to the broad Rhine
  If I would claim my dead.

Where, then, when we are dust,
Shall we, as dead men must,
  Go forth to claim our own?
We that have for winding-sheet
Only the pale bands of sleet
  And wind for a headstone?

The Green Christs.

Christ was hanged upon a tree—
But it was slain before He.

Men say Christ rose from the dead:
It stood quietly and decayed,

Bleeding out its pale blood
Into Golgotha's dark mud.

Christ in heaven shines tenderly;
There is no heaven for a slain tree.

Why do we kill its million kin
Each time that Christ's birth comes again,

Sparing neither youth nor age,
A leaf darker than Herod's page,

But wreaking vengeance on the meek
Green Christs, for Jesus' sake?

In his white name who stood for love,
Let kindliness return above.

The sweet serene and dreaming sod
Whose green lords never slew their god.

Let the world know that Christ's breath
Breathes life, and not death!

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE number of books produced jointly by a group of thinkers is increasing. We must frankly confess that as a class they disappoint us. There is frequently a sudden dip below the average level; there is sometimes a lack of cohesion among the parts; there sometimes arises a doubt as to the existence of any real unity of purpose. Here is one, however, to which none of these criticisms is applicable, even remotely. It is entitled *Adventure*, with the sub-title *The Faith of Science and the Science of Faith* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net).

It consists of six essays. Canon STREETER writes on 'Moral Adventure' and 'Finality in Religion'; Mr. Alexander S. RUSSELL, D.Sc., on 'The Dynamic of Science'; Mr. John MACMURRAY, M.A., on 'Beyond Knowledge' and 'Objectivity in Religion'; and Miss Catherine M. CHILCOTT, M.A., on 'Myth and Reality.' Each essay is prefaced by a synopsis of its argument, and the whole book has an admirable index.

Very emphatically we would state, underline, and insist that it is a book to get. Had this note appeared a month ago, we should have added 'and to give'; a better gift-book for a minister we cannot conceive. It will freshen up his preaching, it will cast new light from an interesting angle upon the basal doctrines of his working creed. For the lay-reader who is interested in the big moral and theological discussions of our time, the book may be very cordially recommended likewise.

The standard of excellence is so high and so uniform that to pick out one topic as a sample for our readers is a task which we attempt with some reluctance. The one we have selected is not more interesting than the others, nor is it more adequately treated than the others are, it is just a fair sample. We choose it on the useful principle *place aux dames*, and we shall try to show what Miss CHILCOTT makes of a stiff doctrine like the Incarnation.

In general, with regard to the fundamental questions about the mediatorial function of Christ, Miss CHILCOTT explains that her purpose is not so much to give a new answer 'as to examine the traditional solutions from a slightly different point of view. For my whole thesis is that an answer —if by that we mean some positive and final solution—is not to be looked for, only a progressive understanding to which this or that interpretation gives a direction of greater or less value.' Christ became man, she holds, in order that we might have the fullest revelation of God which is possible. 'We could never have known God unless He had been presented to us in terms of human personality. For ultimately personality is not only the highest category of being of which we are cognisant, but it is also the only thing which we can know in the fullest sense of the term.' God 'must be brought within the scope of our human experience, and this is most fully and completely done by enabling personality to embrace personality, by enabling

us to know God under the highest terms of which our nature makes us capable.'

But the Incarnation gives us also a revelation of the possibilities of human life, Christ being perfect Man; and Christian thought has swung between two extremes, exalting now one side of this revelation rather than the other. The one which emphasizes the Divine has led to a need being felt for other mediators, such as the Virgin and the Saints, or to an emptying of the value of Christ's human experience for us. Over-emphasizing of the human aspect has also led to defects; it gives us an example, but we need more than an example. Man 'needs not only an example but a Presence; not only discipline but inspiration and living fire; sacrifice, discipline and death must be made the means to life.'

The problem of Christ's humanity, Miss CHILCOTT holds, is put in its acutest form in the question, 'Could Christ have sinned?' Many will say that, if He could, He was not God. 'Yet we must still insist that, however shocking it may be to maintain that Christ was liable to sin, the New Testament explicitly states that He was tempted, and nothing short of liability to sin can make temptation a reality. Again, it seems difficult to conceive of the purpose of the Incarnation, if the process stops short just where our human life is most beset with difficulties. It looks like a failure of love—it looks like fear, if we are to assert that Christ refused to shoulder, or could not shoulder, this our last and heaviest burden. And suppose we admit that Christ could have sinned, what does this involve? Surely no more than this: that at every stage in His life alternatives lay before Him, both of which were good, but one better than the other, and He was free to choose the less good if He wished. If we deny to His humanity that attribute, we leave Him little.'

But the Incarnation is to be conceived of, not as a single act, but as 'an eternal law for ever finding realization in history, the Word for ever becoming flesh.' That means that 'all living souls are God expressed in finite terms.' 'Christ's historic experience is not unique in kind in the sense that nothing approaching it ever happened before or could ever happen again. It is an instance of a process of which our lives are also instances.' But if all men are expressions of God, have we not diminished the unique value of the life of Christ? No. 'The fact of history which could illumine for us the whole purpose of creation, must needs be unique, or why had we need to wait until the time of revelation? And more explicitly we may affirm of Christ that His life is set apart by its perfection. Its conditions are the same as ours, but its triumphant mastery of those conditions raises it beyond. It was this which enabled the Incarnation to flood with light the whole process of creation which the feeble glimmer of our lives could never have illumined.' 'Christ's realization and fulfilment of manhood was not an obscuring of the Divine nature within Him, but its necessary expression and unfolding, and for us too the realization of our humanity is the fulfilment of the Divinity within us. The Incarnation offers us a pledge both of the reality of God in the world and of the reality of God's nature in man.'

Old Testament criticism may be bewildering, but assuredly it is not dull. In its present phase it furnishes variety enough to satisfy the most exacting taste for excitement. The date of Deuteronomy, the connexion of that law-book with the reformation of Josiah, the post-exilic date of the Psalter, the existence of Maccabæan psalms—these and a score of other positions supposed to be more or less fixed have been assailed, and opinions which had almost grown to be axioms have recently been boldly challenged and even roundly denied. The fear which used to be expressed, that criticism was establishing a tradition which was rapidly becoming as sacrosanct as the orthodoxy which it assailed, has turned out to be groundless. Criticism challenges everything and not least the results with which it was itself once content.

One of the most radical of recent challenges is *A History of the Religion of Judaism* (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net), by Emeritus Professor Archibald DUFF, LL.D., D.D. The book is not written primarily as a challenge: it is what it professes

to be—an attempt to reveal the inner spirit of the Judaism of the three centuries from 500 to 200 B.C., in order that, in the end, we may the better understand Jesus, who was, in some sense and to some degree, the product of influences which were then regnant, or at any rate present, in Jewish religion. But in the course of this attempt there is many a clash with current opinion. This is all to the good, for only thus can science grow.

Whatever Professor DUFF has to say on the Old Testament, however unconventional, deserves not only a respectful but an attentive hearing. He has been teaching its literature for fifty years, he is familiar with German, English, and American scholarship, and he has himself made substantial contributions to Old Testament science. He is very conscious in this volume of going a way of his own—'eager,' as he describes himself, 'to gain a hearing for unusual statements.'

One of these 'unusual statements' is that Ezra cannot be a personal name. It is Aramaic for 'The Help,' and was most probably intended as a designation of Nehemiah. Recent scholars have been inclined to transfer Ezra to a period about fifty years later than that with which he has been customarily associated; but this suggestion would have the effect of spiriting him off the stage of history altogether.

Equally radical, and more important for our understanding of Judaism, is Dr. DUFF's view of the Priestly Document known as P. This, he tells us, 'contains and expresses the soul of all the remarkable development whose climax was Jesus.' Doubtless P has often been unjustly abused and depreciated, but never, perhaps, has he been treated so generously as in this volume. Starting from Ex 25^{22}—'there I will commune with thee of all things which I will give thee in commandment unto the children of Israel'—the writer argues that one of the essential features of Judaism was a continuous trust in fresh revelations of the will of God—in other words, 'in a never-ceasing Inspiration.' True, as he points out, P did undergo modifications, as time went on; but the kind of 'revelation' in which P was interested was hardly a revelation of the will of God, as that will was understood by the prophets.

Dr. DUFF makes the ingenious suggestion that the Sanctuary referred to in Ex 25 was not the Tent, but the Ark, or Casket, or 'precious Box,' which served the twofold purpose of a Library destined as the repository of the P document and of a throne on which Jahweh would sit; or, to be more precise, the Cover is the Throne: and the Cover is described as the Tray of Reception, and the precious Tray for receiving blood-drops from the sacrificial victim—drops which marked the Tray as Jahweh's Throne, just as other drops marked other things as His.

There are other equally startling statements; as for example, that the traditional view given in Kings of Ahaz and Manasseh is sacerdotally prejudiced and not borne out by the facts, and that Isaiah's preaching so affected Ahaz, 'hitherto a graceless young man,' that he 'became the bulwark of the prophetic work.' Nobody will accuse this criticism of conventionality; nor is there anything conventional in the view that Aeschylus may have learned much during the Persian war from Hebrews who may have been among the Persian soldiery on the Bosporus, and that his 'Prometheus Vinctus is simply a Greek version of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.'

It is on this point of the spiritual interrelations between Hebrew thinkers and those of other nations that Dr. DUFF is most suggestive, if also highly challenging. Most people are willing to admit that Israel adopted, and transformed in adopting, some of the beliefs of the nations with which she came into contact; but Dr. DUFF is prepared to go further than most; he believes that Egypt and Babylon, in the persons of Ikhnaton and Hammurabi, left an indelible mark on the religion of Israel. He puts it thus: 'it was from an Egyptian heretic king that the foundation faith came, and from an older Babylonian prince came the moral sanctions with which the Hebrews set out on this spiritual road.'

Dr. Duff would not be without support in this contention. At the recent Old Testament Conference held at Oxford, Professor J. M. P. Smith of Chicago argued that there was a monotheism in Egypt before the historical career of Israel began at all, though Dr. Oesterley replied by maintaining that the monotheism of Egypt was a very different thing from the subsequent monotheism of Israel. There we must leave this matter at present.

This book on the Religion of Judaism would have been well worth writing if only for the elaborate chapter on Habakkuk. To the best of our knowledge it is the only discussion in English that deals at appropriate length with the view that the historical background of Habakkuk is not the period of Jeremiah and the early Babylonian empire, but the fourth century, and that the world-conqueror denounced in ch. 2 is no other than Alexander the Great. This view, started by Duhm over twenty years ago, is gradually winning acceptance among scholars, and it is fortunate that we have now the case for it argued so fully and lucidly by Dr. Duff.

These incidental points, however, interesting and suggestive as they are, are subsidiary to the main purpose of the book, which is to give us a fresh and vivid picture of the Judaism which prepared the way for Christ. This Dr. Duff has done by sketching the later Biblical and some of the Apocryphal literature, and by expounding the inner significance of the Synagogue, the Septuagint, and the Targums. In his hands Judaism is a nobler and more generous thing than it is commonly allowed to be. Any one whose mind is made up about Judaism would do well to acquaint himself with this unconventional treatment of it by an independent mind. We look forward with lively interest to the promised second volume.

There can be no doubt that the supreme question in religion is that of authority. Reference was made in a recent number of The Expository Times to the somewhat inconclusive discussions on the point at the Summer Conference of Congregationalists at Oxford. No one seemed to be clear as to where the seat of authority in religion lies. An altogether different attitude, however, is adopted by a writer in the current *Congregational Quarterly*. Dr. B. L. Woolf, of whom more will be heard, has contributed an article of exceptional interest and value, which he entitles 'The Authority of the Risen Lord.' That is a proper description, but the article covers a great deal of important ground and is worth summarizing.

He begins with the earthly ministry of Jesus, and makes his point at once. However great and wonderful Jesus was as a Teacher or as a Character, that is not sufficient to account for Christian experience. It is clear that what the Gospels give us is only a beginning, 'what Jesus began to do and to teach.' Two facts may be cited to prove this. One is that the most important parts of the New Testament were written prior to the Gospels. Indeed, it was largely in the light of the former that the latter were written at all. This means that much vital Christian experience took place after the Crucifixion. The second is that the vital change of atmosphere when one passes from the Gospels to the Acts can be explained only by a valid enrichment of a legitimate experience. In other words, the Christian faith depends directly, but only partly, upon the Gospel records.

It is true, and must be emphasized, that the Gospel records are necessary. The distinction often drawn between the 'Jesus of History' and the 'Christ of Experience' is gravely misleading. The 'Universal Christ' is nothing when divorced from Jesus of Nazareth. Faith cannot come to its fullness or certainty unless it is firmly rooted in the Jesus of the Gospels. But it cannot be left there. It is notable that the Apostles seldom invoked the memory of Jesus. They did not deify it. It was important to keep the memory sacred, but the memory was not the dominant factor in the authority of Jesus after the Crucifixion.

After that crisis we find that Jesus is worshipped as Lord. The influence He exercises is not that of a memory personified and revered. There is little turning of the eyes to the wonderful days in Galilee. What we find is that the Apostles all believe themselves to be in relation with a living Lord. And there is little difference between this relation and their relation to God. What they knew of God was what they found in Jesus. And apart from Him and His message they had little or nothing to say about God. That is to say, the authority the living Lord exercised was identical with that of God. It was Divine authority.

This raises three questions which the writer proceeds to answer. The first is: On what grounds was such authority ascribed to Him? The answer lies in two facts—the Resurrection of Christ and Pentecost. On the one hand, the authority of Jesus was founded upon His immediate influence upon individuals and upon the society of believers. And on the other hand, this was made possible by the gift of the Spirit, which was an experience of power, life, and personal communion with the living Lord. And so the authority of Jesus rested on the immediate personal experience of a contact of soul with soul, accompanied by ethical and spiritual renewal of a unique type.

The second question is: On what grounds is such authority to be ascribed to Jesus to-day? That authority is only to be found in the inmost experience of a believing soul. The writer proceeds to consider what this experience is. It is a sense of impact, in which things take place in our life, an ethical redemption, a renewal spiritually and morally. And then there is also an inflow of power. And finally there is the clear identification of this inward Master with the Jesus whose words and deeds are recorded in the Gospels. Thus the voice of the historical record, the inner sanctions of the ethical and religious self, and the immediate influence of the risen Lord unite into one authority with a power and an urgency of the highest conceivable order.

The third question is briefly dealt with: In what way is Jesus the ultimate spiritual authority? How does this authority express itself? The writer warns us against the attempt to stereotype this authority in an institution or a tradition, and makes a plea for freedom. The one sure thing is that in religion Jesus is Master. He is ever new because He is ever present. He is the Lord of life. Such is the conclusion of a really notable essay. The answer it gives to the question so often raised, and so feebly answered, at the Oxford Congress is surely the one sufficient answer. It is definite, and that is what we ask. It is as definite as the Roman answer or the Fundamentalist answer. And it is satisfying. It is a present, living, actual authority. It is the only authority we can recognize as present and as sufficient. It is sufficient because it is the one authority to which we bow, that of God.

Mr. Hugh J. SCHONFIELD, in *An Old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew's Gospel*, makes the startling claim that the du Tillet MS. of St. Matthew's Gospel, published in 1555, and hitherto considered to be a Hebrew version of the Vulgate, may be a descendant of a lost Hebrew original of St. Matthew's Gospel, and that at any rate it contains within itself evidences of the existence of a Hebrew original underlying St. Matthew's text.

A comparison of Mr. SCHONFIELD's translation of the Hebrew Matthew—for which we owe him a debt of gratitude—with our English Version reveals many interesting variants, and a careful consideration of them would help us to form a judgment on his thesis.

A very interesting reading in the Hebrew Matthew is to be found in 8^{20}: 'And Jesus saith unto him, Foxes have holes, and the birds of the heavens nests; but the Son of man hath not a floor (קרקע) whereon he may lay his head.' No doubt Mr. SCHONFIELD is inclined to see in this last clause an authentic touch of the Master, and accordingly to derive support from it for his theory of a Hebrew (and not merely an Aramaic or Syriac) original.

Certainly the addition of the word 'floor' seems

to lend a new pathos to the utterance. It is suggested that the reference is to a paved recess in the common khan or caravanserai of the village, raised a foot or two above the level of the courtyard where the cattle were tied; there the traveller would find for the merest trifle a place on which to lie and sleep. And yet Jesus could not afford that merest trifle!

But is it the point of the utterance that Jesus was stricken with poverty? As Montefiore remarks, He never seems to have been at a loss for friends or lodgings. Is it not rather that He warned the scribe who wanted to follow Him that He was living at the time a life of wanderings, having no fixed abode? If that is the meaning, then the reference in the Hebrew Matthew to the 'floor of the inn is perhaps not altogether apposite. Could He not always find accommodation there, should the worst come to the worst?

The realistic note struck in this old Hebrew text lends support to Mr. SCHONFIELD's contention that the du Tillet MS. is very early (of the second century A.D., he thinks); but it may be gathered from the foregoing that we should have difficulty in allowing that the reading in 8^{20} supports the argument for a Hebrew original. Indeed, it looks as though the translator has taken liberties with his text.

Leaders of Theological Thought.

KARL HEIM.

By the Reverend Edgar P. Dickie, M.C., M.A., B.D. (Edin.), B.A. (Oxon.), Lockerbie.

German philosophy and theology were content, on two great occasions, to turn their eyes towards sons of the University town of Tübingen. Later still, the twofold mantle of Melanchthon and Hegel fell upon F. C. Baur and Strauss, from whom it has passed, worn and tattered, but not inglorious, to light to-day on the shoulders of Karl Heim. In a time of intellectual upheaval and spiritual longing, Heim is playing an important rôle as the Christian thinker to whom many, of all grades and opinion, look for guidance. As a preacher in the *Stiftskirche* in Tübingen, he is beloved of the common folk, who crowd the church to its doors whenever he is preaching. Apart from his published sermons, which reach a wide audience, his writings represent, on the one hand, the best Christian apologetic of the day, and, on the other, the best exposition of Protestant thought and evangelical theology. As Professor in the theological faculty he lectures daily to some three hundred students, and in his class-room can be seen occasionally an unostentatious visitor from the Roman Catholic faculty. Especially is Heim reckoned as a leader of the German youth. He is looked to for counsel by the numerous youth-movements which have been launched and revived since the War, and he was the founder of the Tübingen circle of the Student Christian Movement, a circle which is now the largest in Germany. It may not be irrelevant to say here that he was born in 1873, and that he served as a chaplain during the War, with battalions of the line and in prison-camps.

He has not been translated into English, but a beginning is now being made in America with an earlier work, *Das Gewissheitsproblem in der systematischen Theologie bis zu Schleiermacher*.

There are two ruling motives which can be felt behind most of his writings. The first is his conscious duty to combat the thought, the popular appeal, the ecclesiastical presuppositions of Roman Catholicism. He maintains a running controversy with his friend and colleague in Tübingen, Karl Adam, of the faculty of Roman Catholic theology (see, e.g., *Hochland*, August 1926).

The second underlying motive is that of giving to evangelical theology a firm foundation in philosophy. In his preface to *Glaubensgewissheit*, he says that the aim of the book is to bring into relation with post-Kantian philosophy the new understanding of the certainty of God, which was a possession of the Early Christian Church and of the Reformers, and to which Karl Barth, in his *Epistle*

to the Romans, has given new and prophetic expression. Hence Heim's philosophy has great prominence in his writings (so much so that a critic has said, 'The philosopher in him has become too strong'). Here the controversy is with Oswald Spengler. If the 'Relativity' theories are right, as they have been applied to ethics and religion, then Christianity is wrong. In a world where everything is infected by relativity there can be found no place for Christ's claim of absoluteness.

His studies of Spengler are important.[1] Spengler himself has gone out of his way to declare that of all the philosophers and theologians who have written on him, Heim has best understood him.

Heim's answer may be summarized. It pivots on the absolute value of the 'perspective view-point.' The set of circumstances in which I live, my 'Destiny,' is beyond the sphere of what is either causal or accidental. It is like the sun, in the light of which I see everything that I see, but into which I cannot myself look. Spengler attempts to dissolve my Ego, with its 'Destiny' (*Schicksal*) into the same chaos of relativity which has absorbed Time and Space. Are we to believe that it is a matter of mere accident, blind fate, contingency, that to me there fell just this set of circumstances out of the manifold possibilities of the universe? No, says Heim. It is not a case of my being born *into* a special set of Time- and Space-circumstances. Look at the matter from my view-point. You see that the circumstances were born only along with me. I can speak of these circumstances only as they appear placed about my 'Here' and 'Now.' They do not exist till I exist. Their being is bound up with mine. Their appearance, then, was no accidental allocation to me. I and they come or go together. It was not a case of one possibility being chosen out of a waiting row. For the row itself appeared only when the 'chosen' member stepped out. Ego and 'Destiny' cannot be considered apart. They came into being together and belong together. The relativity applies only to each member, considered by itself; applies, that is, to that which has never existed! Taken together, the two provide a fixed point from which the universe can be measured; a star to every wandering bark of thought. The fatal mistake of the 'relativist' philosopher is to imagine that the Here, Now, or I can be objectified at all, even to the extent of speaking of them as arbitrary, accidental, relative, and the like. These perspective points cannot themselves be argued about. They are the presuppositions of all argument. The 'ego' which lies behind all knowledge and all experience is 'unobjectifiable.' It is therefore *out of* Space and Time. My 'Destiny,' so far from being a limitation, from which I must escape in order to see the truth, is indeed a flying platform from which alone I can observe.

There is an unobjectifiable reality beyond all experience, which alone makes experience possible. Heim, we feel, is not bound to the conception of that reality as an individual human 'Ego.' That form he inherits from Kant's 'synthetic unity of apperception'; but, deriving it also from Rickert's 'pure consciousness,' he makes it clear thereby that he implies no localizing of it. His ground-thought is that the individual experience, possible only because of this reality, is nevertheless not imposed by that reality, but *allowed.* He speaks, not of 'my' experience, but of the experience of God 'in me.' God allows me, out of His grace, to have a share in His all-comprehending view of the world.

With this gained, we come face to face with the fact of Christ, and a new line of thought emerges. On the doctrine of the perspective view-point there now falls the accent of Eternity. With Christ there is opened up a new perspective-world. His life on earth is, like all historical events, relative. But His contact with any human life is not relative, but an absolute. While Barth declares that the historical Jesus, like all that is historical and psychological, shares in the *uncertainty* of all historical things,[2] Heim is prepared to say that the historical Jesus shares in the *relativity* of all historical things. But not so Jesus in His contact with men. For a man to be 'in Christ' is a thing not of relative, but of absolute significance. (We return to this later.)

This thought gives the starting-point for his constructive theology—a theology essentially of grace. (His first publication, *Das Wesen der Gnade,* was a study of the subject with special reference to Alexander of Hales.) Only from the experience of grace does the depth of sin open up before us. Sin cannot be thought of as a primal *state*: it must be thought of as a primal *deed.* Moreover, the Fall destroyed not only man's state of innocence: it destroyed also the ability to conceive such a state; it paralysed the power of 'thinking sin away.' Further, the primal act was not an occurrence in time: if it had been so we should still be able to think ourselves back into the state of

[1] Especially two essays in *Glaube und Leben,* on the 'Schicksalgedanke' of Spengler.

[2] Cf. the article on Barth in *The Hibbert Journal,* April 1927.

innocence. Had it been so, also, we should be able to some extent to raise *ourselves* out of a state of corruption back into the state of innocency. But that also we cannot do. The recurring note in all Heim's theology is the utter helplessness of man.

It is sounded again in his doctrine of the world. The world lieth in evil. To stand in the presence of God is to know that the whole creation is unclean before Him. There is a connexion between sin and the ground-form of the world; between the rupture of our fellowship with God and the fact that God remains for us invisible and uncertain.[1] The suffering of the world is the consequence of the guilt of the world. But it is doubtful whether Heim here, with the difficult phrase 'supra-temporal act of sin' and the doctrine of 'the world lying under a curse,' has done more than give a philosophical rendering of the familiar picture—the picture of men as fallen angels, labouring in a world of sorrow, with their eyes turned sometimes longingly upwards to the heaven from whence they have been thrust. His cosmology conceives the world too much as a valley of humiliation, too little as a vale of soul-making.

His chief contribution is elsewhere, in his discussion of the Atonement. This may be summarized:[2] At the outset we are met with the familiar contradiction, Nothing but free Divine forgiveness can save us; and yet, God is not free simply to forgive. When man has grown aware of the utter helplessness to which his sin has reduced him, it becomes clear to him that, 'if there is any help at all in this situation, anything to save him from going under, then it can consist only in a pure, unconditional forgiveness. I cannot do the smallest thing that would even prepare the way for this forgiveness.' And yet, God cannot simply forgive, as if to forgive were His *métier*; nor, again, can He simply overcome and defeat sin. Neither sentimental indulgence nor destroying omnipotence will satisfy even man as a means of delivering him. Instead, 'we see Jesus.' At the end of all discussion of the Person of Jesus we are compelled to say, with Luther and Melanchthon, that every definition of the nature of Christ is no more than an unfolding of the truth of faith, that 'He is our Lord and Redeemer.'

Heim, then, examines four representative theories of the Atonement. (1) *The theory of sacrifice.* Jesus is the lamb brought to slaughter as sacrifice for the sins of the world. The sacrifices of the Old Testament receive only now their true meaning: they were 'shadows of the future.' The idea of sacrifice has only now rid itself of inner contradictions, as a scheme of salvation, by being embodied in the voluntary sacrifice of the eternal High-priest. (2) *The theory of vicarious suffering.* Jesus died as a condemned criminal. That thought suggests the symbolic significance of His death. He died, the innocent for the guilty. This second theory (and with it, by implication, the first also) Heim shows to be of itself insufficient. There is a conflict between the absolute demand for punishment of the rebellious will and the unconditional compassion of God. The conflict is insoluble by thought. The idea of the vicarious suffering of Christ is not a solution but a statement of its insolubility. (3) *The theory of satisfaction.* By the death of Jesus the unconditional demand of God is satisfied without the annihilating punishment of the rebellious will being necessary. This theory, too, is insufficient. The life of Jesus is part of finite reality, and so, like all finite reality, belonged in any case to God. (4) We fall back on the simple concept of *a pardoning act* of God, performed and announced in Jesus Christ. But does this thought surmount the difficulties attaching to the preceding theories? No, replies Heim. It is involved in the same circumstances, for we are compelled to say that forgiveness implies the treatment of past sin as good; implies, consequently, that God, in face of past sin, renounces His claim to absoluteness. And yet, God remains God only when He is Lord of all reality, and therefore of all past events.

If reason had the last word, the difficulty would be insuperable. But forgiveness as a fact has power to break down the barrier between past fact and present reality. Reason (as Luther says) sees in Atonement only absurdity, lying. But salvation is not an event, like other events, for which we can think out, or point to, the sufficient cause. Atonement cannot be brought under general laws or principles. It is an impossibility which only the fact of Jesus has been able to resolve.

'All other religions, mystical as well as prophetic, come to men with an Imperative: Exercise yourself in the Buddhist submersion . . . then will you perhaps come to Nirvana! Or: Fast and pray and keep the commandments, then are you helping to bring in the Kingdom of God. . . . In contrast to all these Imperatives, demands, and exercises,

[1] See his *Leitfaden der Dogmatik*, and *Die Weltanschauung der Bibel.*

[2] Using chiefly, his *Das Wesen des evangelischen Christentums*, *Glaube und Leben*, and *Leitfaden der Dogmatik.*

which afflicted and tormented men, the message of the apostles came with quite another significance. It began with a Perfect Indicative.'[1] The Christian teaching takes its stand on a fact for ever accomplished.

Since the significance of the question is a practical one, the vital concern of a man's own conscience; since any theory of Atonement is only a development of the *religious* conviction that 'Jesus is my Lord and my Redeemer,' it follows that the exposition here must build on the facts of religious experience. Heim therefore sets aside such philosophical constructions as that in which Hegel argues that Christianity *is* the absolute religion, for religion is the relation of man and God; logically, the perfect relation is that of identity; and, in Christianity, God and man are identified. This is clearly not the starting-point. The absoluteness claimed by Christianity is an absoluteness in the sphere of redemption. It is on the facts of redemption that we must build.

The uniqueness of Christ is to be understood only by understanding the meaning of His life and of His death. The core of that meaning is the claim of Jesus to forgive sins. Spengler has said that the central thought of the tragic drama of all ages is the irrevocability of time, the impossibility of taking guilt incurred and making it as if it had never been. Christ claims the power to liberate men from this tragedy. All titles that we give to Jesus are simply attempts to express this power to forgive sins.

Karl Adam makes outcry here to say that forgiveness is not the *only* doctrine; that Heim, in thinking that it is, is opposed to early Christianity. There, the central thing was the 'Word made flesh.' Redemption was from more than sin. The fact that Heim relegates the Incarnation to the background is bound up with his disrespect for the sacramental. For the Incarnation is the great sacramental—God appearing in the guise of flesh. This is typical of Adam's criticism.

Heim goes on his way. In an interesting piece of autobiography,[2] he tells how he tried to hammer out a logical thought-system. The system broke down on one fact. That fact was the claim of Christ. Here, in the New Testament, we find that which shatters philosophy—a man, who has now passed from the world, and yet is not only present in the world, but is master of the world's fate. Our intellectual system has broken down. Logic bows to Reality. Jesus, he discovers, has made essential a μετάνοια of the intellect. It is not a case of finding the place which Jesus occupies in the system of things, but of re-making our whole system round Him.

Admit that the events of Jesus' life and death, viewed simply as historical events, are relative, like other historical happenings. But no event *can* be so considered, if its meaning is to be extracted. Jesus Himself, says the philosopher, since He too appeared in Time and Space, is of relative significance. Humanity is also of relative significance. 'Yes,' we can now reply, 'if you consider them apart. But consider them together. The relation of Christ to the race of men is absolute. He is the one Mediator between God and man. Every man who is brought face to face with Him is brought into a situation of which the significance is absolute.'

It would seem, then, that the absoluteness of Christ can be claimed only as He enters into relation with men; Precisely, replies Heim. For the absoluteness of Christ is absoluteness in the sphere of redemption. He is not known save in this relation to sinful men. The pre-existence of Christ means the pre-existence of Him who is the Redeemer of the world.

One last point should be mentioned. Karl Adam strongly assails Heim's theology for its failure to do justice to the concept of the Church. ('A kind of ecclesiastical Nihilism,' he calls it.) There is truth in the charge. And the difficulty with which Heim wrestles is characteristic of his thought. He bases all religious experience on the lonely communion of the human soul with God. 'Every man lives on a lonely island. We are all like prisoners in solitary confinement: none of us can see into the cell of the other. We can communicate one with another only laboriously by knocks. . . . We are never certain whether it is an illusion, when we imagine that the other has really understood us.' Again, he speaks of 'our loneliness with the question of eternity.' We feel our loneliness most in the noisiest gathering. 'Seated amidst the most interesting company, in the room which is brightly lit by lamps, I glance out through an open window, through which looks in the night-sky of eternity.' The religious soul is always μόνος συνὼν μόνῳ. Religious life has not begun until God is found, in solitary communion, by the 'conscience stabbed awake' ('erschrockenes Gewissen').

Thus Heim's doctrine of the Church can indicate, as the bonds which knit the Church, only the sense of a common faith, and a similar saving experience. He has no place for the thought that its members

[1] *Glaube und Leben*, p. 432 ff.

[2] The Preface to *Glaube und Leben*.

have Divine responsibilities for one another and for the world outside; nor for the thought that there are consequences of sin that the Church can bear. He says, for example, that Church and mission cannot stop the causes of war: they can only build an ark where we can hide. The Church is to be regarded only as the conscience of the people; as the world's Good Samaritan.

Most certainly of all, he adds, there is one place into which the Church cannot intrude, that place where a man has his 'Jacob's wrestling' alone with God, where he stands with his past life before the flaming eyes of God.

It is on this conviction, of the utter loneliness of the soul with God, that Heim's doctrine of the Church must founder. And the conviction has only half of the truth. It does seem to be that, in the critical moment, when we have to choose or reject Christ, we stand alone in making our decision. And yet, it is also true that the decision is already made. It is largely determined by our upbringing, by our intercourse with those we love, by our fellowship with those who pray for us. We are not alone even with our sins before God. The Cross of Christ means that at least. Does it not also mean that human nature at its highest is so built that no man need be alone with his sins for lack of human fellowship? that he has with him, even at his loneliest, the love that would go through all for him?

And yet, Heim answers, we are all lonely in death. *Je mourrai seul.* Neither human fellowship nor the Church will avail then. Therefore, God and my soul will I know; nothing more and nothing less.

But has not the thought of loneliness in death more poetical value than religious significance? It is only the physical act that is lonely. We are alone also in falling asleep. If the love and prayers of friends mean anything, if the after-life means anything, we are not alone even in death. It is as if, at a death-bed,

> the bystanders gave each his straw,
> All he had, though a trifle in itself,
> Which, plaited all together, made a Cross
> Fit to die looking on and praying with.[1]

The prayers of the Church are, in reality, the extreme unction of the dying. And, when a man stands alone with his sin face to face with God, even into that Holy of Holies can the Church enter by its fellowship and prayers.

This whole region of things is alien ground to Heim. That he recognizes the inadequacy of his doctrine of the Church is apparent from the words at the end of *Das Wesen des evangelischen Christentums*, where he says that the work of the Church in the world is not the essence of the Church, but only the *expression* of its inner being. Yet we cannot help feeling that Barth has had his influence here. The Church does not find a prominent place in the system because the Church, whatever form it takes, is regarded not as an end in itself, but only as that institution which leads men out where they can realize the ultimate helplessness of every institution.

'A Christocentric theology of the forgiveness of sins': 'Ecclesiastical nihilism.' Of these two phrases of Karl Adam the one has indicated Heim's great strength, the other has touched his most apparent weakness.

[1] *The Ring and the Book*, i. 1095.

Literature.

DANIEL.

So much controversy has gathered round the Book of Daniel that it is difficult to deal with it in an objective and dispassionate spirit. But this estimable end has been achieved by Professor James A. Montgomery, Ph.D., S.T.D., of the University of Pennsylvania in his *Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (T. & T. Clark; 20s. net)—the latest volume to be published of the 'International Critical Commentary' series. Much philological material has accumulated in recent years, and the writer has given his chief strength to the philology and the textual criticism of the book: indeed, he hopes by his volume to advance the cause of Aramaic studies. But that is not to say that the historical and literary problems of the book have been neglected. Very far from it. He has discussed them not only with adequacy but with independence, and has sometimes challenged positions which have been commonly accepted by most recent criticism. For example, he does not regard the whole book as Maccabæan; he regards it as falling into two divisions, of which chaps. 7–12

are connected with the Maccabæan uprising in 168–165 B.C., while chaps. 1–6 he holds to be pre-Maccabæan, composed in Babylonia, and belonging roughly to the third century. Nebuchadrezzar and Darius, who are friendly souls, are not really modelled on Antiochus. The volume recognizes 'a far greater amount of historical tradition in the book than the older criticism had allowed'; and Dr. Montgomery frankly admits that 'there still remain excellent modern scholars who vigorously defend the original position,' and that 'the fresh archæological data seem to lead to more disputes with no greater prospect of composition of the debate.'

The impartiality of such an attitude, coupled with the wide and accurate learning attested by every page of the commentary, assures us that we are in the hands of a real scholar. The crucial phrases receive minute attention in a special excursus; for example, the 'Seventy Weeks,' the history of the exegesis of which is described as the 'Dismal Swamp of Old Testament Criticism,' and the 'son of man,' 'the most notable crux in this book'—a phrase whose interpretation Dr. Montgomery holds to be neither Messianic nor mythological but symbolic, the 'son of man' being 'type of the people of the saints.'

DR. FOAKES-JACKSON ON ST. PETER.

Dr. Foakes-Jackson has followed his very fine book on St. Paul with another on the other great Apostle—*Peter, Prince of Apostles: A Study in the History and Tradition of Christianity* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). The two books are very dissimilar in character and (we cannot help thinking) in achievement. The 'Life of St. Paul' was a fascinating essay, full of life and movement, with a flowing narrative and rich in suggestion. The present volume on St. Peter is as learned, indeed more learned, but not nearly so interesting. The writer impresses on us the importance of Peter; he goes so far as to say that, as the protagonist of the Church, Peter is 'of even greater importance than Paul himself'; but he does not convince us. We have the impression that he does not convince himself. We know singularly little of Peter, and, though he has a great place in legend and tradition, that does not amount to much in the sense of knowledge. And if (as Dr. Foakes-Jackson thinks) 1 Peter is not by the Apostle, we know less than we thought we did.

The writer has two objects in his study of Peter: to give us an interest in the first days of Christianity by delineating its pioneer, and to enlist our interest in the question, how far tradition is to be respected where direct historical material is scanty. Accordingly we have in the book four sections: first, Peter in the Gospels; second, Peter in the early Church; third, Peter in later days; and fourth, Peter in tradition. It need not be said that a scholar of Dr. Foakes-Jackson's attainments, and a writer of his skill, has shed much light on all these subjects. He interests us always, or nearly always, but as a guide he certainly does not err on the side of definiteness. There are, for example, two critical points at which we wish he had been more helpful. One is the great saying of Christ to Peter, 'On this rock.' Does he believe in its genuineness? The answer is not very clear. The other is the question, Did St. Peter visit Rome, and was he the first bishop? The author says, 'the present writer not only believes but desires to believe in Peter's visit to Rome.' Yet he admits that there is no real historical proof of the visit, and says definitely, 'the fact remains that nothing has survived to connect St. Peter with Rome, till we come to the days of Irenæus.' The 'desire to believe' is, in one direction, a healthy state of mind, but it is not generally regarded as an adequate attitude to history.

The elements of interest in this book are many. It is a fine blend of archæology, New Testament criticism, Church history, and legend. And in both the tasks which he has set himself (as referred to above) the author certainly succeeds to admiration. Some readers, who are more learned than the generality, will be specially attracted by chapters on Peter in Jewish legend or Peter in the Christian world. Others will be attracted by the early chapters on the gospel narrative. Controversial minds will fasten on the chapters which deal with Peter's relation to the Roman Church. But we question whether any of them will obtain the enjoyment they derived from the former delightful commentary on (*pace* Dr. Foakes-Jackson) a far greater man.

HOW TO TEACH THE NEW TESTAMENT.

How to Teach the New Testament (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), by the Rev. Frederick J. Rae, M.A., Director of Religious Education in the Aberdeen Training Centre, is supplementary to and uniform with the same author's recent work on the Old Testament, which has already attracted much attention in Britain and America. Each of the sixty-six chapters, beginning with the birth

of Jesus and ending with the last days of St. Paul, is divided into three sections. The first contains information on general points and on points of difficulty connected with the lesson. The second contains notes on obscure terms, on geographical or historical references, and on expressions that need some elucidation. The third contains the lesson, based on this general and detailed information. The endeavour is made throughout to express the permanent religious meaning of the incidents, and this is often enforced by apt and fresh illustration.

The author's standpoint is at once modern and conservative, and his expositions are informed with the wisdom of the practised teacher. A few quotations will bring this out: 'The incidents [of the Temptation of Jesus] are pictorial representations of spiritual realities'; 'this psychological reading of the incident [of the Transfiguration] does not preclude the conviction that the experience was the means of a real revelation from the unseen'; 'if teachers find the "nature" miracles difficult of belief, let them realize that the important thing for them to do is to teach the truth embodied in the miracle'; 'our faith in the Resurrection is not based, happily, on these stories [of the post-Resurrection appearances].'

We commend this book very cordially to the teacher of religion, be he clerk or layman; he will like its lucidity and terseness, its directness and vivacity, and he will be grateful for the guidance towards further study so judiciously given in its pages.

ISRAEL AND THE NATIONS.

Of late it has been increasingly felt that a proper understanding of the Hebrew people demands a knowledge of the various empires with which they successively came in contact. This need has been ably met by two recent books, which traverse very much the same ground and along paths not very different. The less expensive book, *Israel in World History*, by the Rev. A. W. F. Blunt, B.D. (Milford; 2s. 6d. net), to whom we already owe a fine sketch of 'Israel's Social and Religious Development' in the same 'World's Manuals' series, has the advantage of offering several maps with admirable illustrations of scenery and reproductions of important ancient monuments. Mr. Blunt deals in successive chapters with the early Babylonian empire, the Egyptian empire, Israel's chance of empire, Syria and Assyria, the decline and fall of Assyria, the Chaldæan empire, the Persian empire, Syria and Egypt, and Rome and the Jews. The one hundred and twenty-seven pages of this volume are crowded with a bewildering array of facts, through which, however, Mr. Blunt's clear articulation of his material enables the reader to thread his way. There are in the book some memorable characterizations of men—for example, Esarhaddon and Cyrus—and movements; we emerge from the middle part of the story with a deep horror of Assyrian military methods. Numerous as are the facts which the writer has to marshal, he can bring an independent judgment to bear upon them. He thinks it 'scarcely credible,' for example, that the terrible disaster which befell Sennacherib's army could have taken place in 701 B.C. Altogether a highly useful volume, which needs and will reward careful study.

The other book, *Israel amongst the Nations*, by Mr. Norman H. Baynes, of University College, London (S.C.M.; 5s. net), gives an equally reliable and comprehensive sketch of the long historical development, but is peculiar in that much very valuable matter is thrown into the notes, which cover little less than half the book. These notes display a minute acquaintance with the abundant mass of bibliographical material; it would be a liberal education in ancient Hebrew history to note the alternative explanations or reconstructions tabulated here and to make up one's mind about them. Mr. Baynes is not afraid to express his own preferences, and even sometimes to embark on conjectural reconstructions. He leans, for example, to the view that the period of Abraham is about 1500, and that the Exodus may be dated in the reign of Merenptah, about 1220; and he offers a fascinating sketch of Jehoiakim as indulging in a definite anti-Jahwistic policy, embittered as he may have been by the unhappy fate of Josiah at Megiddo, which may well have seemed to discredit his reforms and to justify the re-introduction of other forms of worship. Mr. Baynes' discussion becomes particularly interesting where it touches the debt of Hebrew religion to other religions, such as Zoroastrianism; and his argument tends to support the view that, while such influence was real and unquestionable, many of the most valuable elements in later Judaism do not require to be set down as borrowings, but can be satisfactorily explained as developments within the Hebrew religion itself, and that consequently what we have is not so much a debt as rather what Principal Fairbairn used to call 'developmental coincidence.'

BERTRAND RUSSELL.

Sir William Hamilton is credited with the assertion that one equation is universally true, namely, 'mathematical genius equal general blockhead.' This assertion, repeated in Gath, has been the occasion of many a chuckle among the Philistines. Were Sir William alive to-day he would find the tables completely turned, for the mathematicians have invaded his own field of philosophy in strong force, and for any one to treat such a subject as, say, the relation of mind and matter without a competent knowledge of modern physics and mathematics would be to invite ridicule. Some of the ablest philosophers of our time are primarily mathematicians. One need only mention Whitehead and Eddington, to name but two. Of others who have approached philosophy from the side of mathematics, few have written with more force and point than Mr. Bertrand Russell, and he has now added to his reputation by the issue of *An Outline of Philosophy* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). It is the work of a mind bold, independent and penetrating, strong on the side of criticism and resolute in 'thinking things down,' to use Thomas Goodwin's phrase. In Part I. he deals with 'man from without,' that is, man in so far as he can be understood from his actions. Here, while going a long way with the Behaviourist school, he comes to a point where 'behaviourism as a final philosophy breaks down,' because in all our perception there is an inescapable subjective element. Part II. deals with the physical world. 'No philosophy can ignore the revolutionary changes in our physical ideas which the men of science have found necessary; indeed, it may be said that all traditional philosophies have to be discarded, and we have to start afresh with as little respect as possible for the systems of the past. Our age has penetrated more deeply into the nature of things than any earlier age, and it would be a false modesty to overestimate what can still be learned from the metaphysicians of the seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth centuries.' Mr. Russell's exposition of Relativity and the Quantum Theory, though lucid, is perhaps too compressed to be readily intelligible to a reader without previous knowledge. He hesitates to accept Bohr's theory of the planetary constitution of the atom, and prefers to follow the view of Heisenberg and Schrödinger that the atom is a mysterious entity of which we know nothing except when an electron jumps the rails (if it be on rails) and sends out a radiation. In any case, whatever theory be adopted, 'the gap between mind and matter has been filled in, partly by new views on mind, but much more by the realization that physics tells us nothing as to the intrinsic character of matter.' Parts III. and IV. treat of man from within, and his place in the universe. The argument is too elaborate to summarize, but the view put forward is that 'both mind and matter are structures composed of a more primitive stuff which is neither mental nor material.' 'It will be seen that the view which I am advocating is neither materialism nor mentalism, but what (following a suggestion of Dr. H. M. Sheffer) we call "neutral monism." It is monism in the sense that it regards the world as composed of only one kind of stuff, namely, events; but it is pluralism in the sense that it admits the existence of a great multiplicity of events, each minimal event being a logically self-subsistent entity.'

A sentence or two in conclusion may show the writer's general attitude. 'While our knowledge of what is has become less than it was formerly supposed to be, our knowledge of what may be is enormously increased.' 'The physical world, so far as science can show at present, is perhaps less rigidly determined by causal laws than it was thought to be; one might, more or less fancifully, attribute even to the atom a kind of limited free will. There is no need to think of ourselves as powerless and small in the grip of vast cosmic forces. . . . The mood, as it seems to me, in which the modern man should face the universe is one of quiet self-respect. The universe as known to science is not in itself either friendly or hostile to man, but it can be made to act as a friend if approached with patient knowledge.' This is a book which merits and will doubtless receive wide attention and serious study.

JOHN BUNYAN.

Is there any need for another life of Bunyan? If there is, the right man has taken it in hand. Some two years ago the Rev. Gwilym O. Griffith wrote 'St. Paul's Life of Christ,' a book of some distinction from a mind worth watching. And the same qualities have been put into this new venture—*John Bunyan* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). It is a trying ordeal to have one's pages thickly sprinkled with that master's wonderful English, which makes any other style, laid alongside of it, look drab and faded. But Mr. Griffith comes through the ordeal astonishingly well. For his own style is refreshingly pointed and vivid, and

full of colour. And his eyes see things and down into the heart of them; and he can set them for us on his pages so that we must see them too. It is a brave figure he has to paint, and he does it well, with knowledge and affection. What is one to make of that tremendous struggle in Bunyan's soul, of the lightnings and thunders through which his shrinking spirit had to pass, of that pulling for his soul, as he put it, between God and the devil? Looking at his father's record, perhaps Freud's explanation may fit here more aptly than usual. But there is vastly more than that. Apparently the men of that time were swept by emotions as we are not; witness the House of Commons in tears, and Coke—shrewd lawyer though he was—sitting down overcome by the rush of his feelings. The strong silent men of our imagination were strong enough, but not by any means so silent as we picture them, or indeed as we are now. Is our restraint a sign of strength, or of a race beginning to degenerate, grown jaded and dulled and much less sensitive to impression? Yet it seems wholly well that most of us are not called to pass into the Kingdom by the rough road which Bunyan took. I have observed, says Boston, that matters of moment come to me 'through several iron gates.' It was a very frowning one that Bunyan had to pass. Yet in the end it led him deep into knowledge and experience of Christ. I wonder if our smoother route takes us as far, if it is really well for us that we find things so easy nowadays.

TEXTS OF THE HEPTATEUCH.

Students of the Latin Bible will welcome the careful study of *The Old Latin Texts of the Heptateuch*, by the Rev. A. V. Billen, M.A., D.D., Ph.D. (Cambridge University Press; 15s. net). The book is a discussion of the Latin text of Gen.-Jud. as represented, in whole or in part, by the three MSS known as Lyons, Munich, and Würzburg. The vocabulary of these MSS is described and characterized, the results are checked by quotations from the Latin Fathers, and the influence of the leading Greek texts upon the Old Latin is discussed. It is interesting to note that even within the same MS. (for example, Lyons) different books of the Heptateuch sometimes use different Latin words to translate the same Greek word, which goes to suggest that there is little real unity in the MS.; indeed, it would seem as if in certain cases there was no real unity even within the same book: it is pretty certain, for example, that the text of both Leviticus and Deuteronomy is composite. The work of translation, as we know, began early: possibly, as Dr. Billen suggests, Tertullian's text depends on an already existing Latin Version, and in several places the Old Latin text itself seems to have depended on a Greek original which is now in a group much less weighty than the three leading types of Greek text. Even those who are more interested in the history of the Latin language than in the Latin Bible will read with profit the discussion of noteworthy words, and particularly the chapter on the style of the MSS. All kinds of interesting facts are stated about the use of pronouns, adjectives, etc., prepositions with the wrong (or at least unclassical) cases—some of the phenomena, like the last, being due to Greek influence. Subtle changes of words—for example, of *donum* to *munus*, or *ministrare* to *sacrificare*—are unmistakable indications of the direction Christian thought was taking within the Church. This book should attract students of the history of the Latin language no less than students of the Bible.

A POPULAR LIFE OF CHRIST.

Canon Anthony C. Deane has commended himself to multitudes by his widely circulated book on 'How to Enjoy the Bible.' And he will very likely achieve as great a success by his new book, *Jesus Christ*, in Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton's 'People's Library' (2s. 6d. net). In spite of the many large and important books on Christ which have recently been published, this one by Canon Deane has a place and a value of its own. Indeed, candidly, we think its value is very much greater than that of some of the bigger books. It is brief, yet, on its own lines, sufficient. Details are omitted, and the writer fixes his eyes (and ours) on the outstanding events and aspects of the life. His main aim is not to decide the momentous question for us, but to provide material for a decision, and he selects his 'moments' so as to bring us face to face with the real personality of Jesus. He rightly perceives that the evidence for the uniqueness of that personality is cumulative. 'We must bring together the things said, and done, and taught, and endured. Little by little the testimony of each part, viewed in relation with the rest, will contribute to the ultimate decision on the whole.' We cannot admire too much the skill and vision with which the writer has selected and presented the salient points. He begins, quite rightly, with the public ministry, and leaves aside all matters connected with the Birth, to be decided after the main issue is faced.

There are many points which might be cited on

which Canon Deane is both sound and helpful. But one in particular must be mentioned to show how sane and true his picture is. The conventional portraits of Jesus, both in words and in pictures, dwell upon His gentleness with such insistence that a quite untrue and unattractive representation is given. Canon Deane does no injustice to this side of Jesus' character. But he dwells frequently on the strength of His personality, instancing His courage (so often exhibited in the Gospels) and His anger at injustice and insincerity. For this we cannot be too grateful, and it shows how clearly and truly the writer has seen the Jesus of the Gospels.

This sketch is based on the best knowledge of our time. But the writer is by no means bound to any school or authority, and from time to time he strikes out on a line of his own which, whether right or wrong, is at any rate original. In conclusion, we express the earnest hope that this admirable picture of the real Jesus may find its way into many hands, for it cannot fail to gain a reverent hearing for Him who spake as no one else ever did.

LATIN INFANCY GOSPELS.

Dr. M. R. James in his new book, *Latin Infancy Gospels* (Cambridge University Press; 10s. net), gives two texts of Latin Infancy Gospels—one the Hereford MS. and the other the Arundel MS. They are printed side by side so that the reader can easily see where they agree and where they differ. He also includes in an appendix a translation in English from the Irish Lebar Brecc, which bears close resemblance in parts to the Arundel MS., and a useful dissertation on the relation between these two latter documents. There is also a valuable Introduction to the whole volume dealing with the composition of all the material. A great deal of the text in these MSS is already in substance, found in the so-called Protevangelium of James and in the Pseudo-Matthew (Gospel of the Infancy), so that the main interest of these MSS is in the new portion that emerges when they come to deal with the birth of Christ. What is the origin of this Section? Dr. James seeks to answer that question in his valuable Introduction. Is the Gospel of Peter the source? That is Dr. James' suggestion, and there is not a little to be said in its favour. Unfortunately the fragment of the Gospel of Peter known to us (see Hennecke, pp. 29–32) deals only with the trial, death, and resurrection of our Lord, and does not deal with the Infancy; but, on the other hand, it is only a fragment, and, as A. Stülchen (Hennecke, 'Apokryphen,' p. 27) and others show, the Gospel did contain an Infancy portion. We know also that it was strongly docetic, and this is the glaring characteristic of Dr. James' new material—its docetism—so that it may well be that this is a part of the Docetic Gospel of Peter so unsparingly repudiated by Serapion (*c.* 190). As a collateral piece of evidence Dr. James points to the similarity of composition and compilation between this new Infancy story and the extant parts of the Gospel of Peter.

The value of the Irish testimony is interesting as a proof that the text was current in Ireland in the twelfth century, and we would welcome more data which might give us information as to intercourse, mediate or direct, between the Church in England and Ireland and the Church in Syria. Scholars will no doubt value this book, not only on critical grounds, but as adding somewhat to our knowledge of the origin and spread and suppression of the docetic movement; and Dr. James is to be congratulated on his discovery, and on the expedition with which he so carefully examined and published it. On p. xv of the Introduction, line 17, should not Section 69 be read as Section 59?

PAINTED GLASS.

It is almost a matter of surprise that to-day any writer is able to find an unexplored field, so that we may admire the ingenuity as well as the industry of the Rev. F. Harrison, M.A., F.S.A., the Librarian of the Dean and Chapter in the ancient city of York. Mr. Harrison has made a study of the mediæval glass in the churches of his city, and has set forth the result of his researches in a handsome volume of two hundred and fifty-three pages, with many photographic illustrations in half-tone and a few in colour. The title of the book is *The Painted Glass of York* (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net). York is particularly rich in painted glass, and the interest in it has been stimulated by the recent restoration of the famous set of windows in the old Minster.

This volume is really a complete guide to the ancient painted and stained glass in the cathedral and parish churches, and though there are some introductory pages dealing with the subject of mediæval glass, the bulk of the book is a detailed description of each window.

In the Preface, the Rev. W. Foxley Norris, D.D., Dean of Westminster, attributes the glory of mediæval glass to the custom of building up each

window *in situ*, so that the effect of the colour in its final setting could be demonstrated. No doubt this was a very ideal procedure, and far preferable to the modern method of working in a studio and bringing to the church a finished production. But surely the real reason for the extraordinary beauty of mediæval ecclesiastical art lay in the fact that its execution was effected in the spirit of worship. It must always be the motive behind art that stamps it with its intrinsic character.

AN OLD HEBREW TEXT.

Mr. Hugh J. Schonfield, a member of the International Hebrew Christian Alliance, has published a book which should be of deep interest to students of the text of the New Testament and the many others who eagerly await the results of textual investigation and discussion. The book is entitled *An Old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew's Gospel* (T. & T. Clark; 6s.), and may be freely used by the general reader. It is a translation with an introduction, notes, and appendices of the du Tillet MS., which is the oldest and most complete Hebrew version at present known of any part of the New Testament. This is interesting and important in itself, but its interest and importance are enhanced when we recollect that, while the du Tillet MS. is a Hebrew version of St. Matthew's Gospel, it is not unlikely that behind the text, whether Latin or Greek, on which it is based, there lay an Aramaic original. Indeed it is Mr. Schonfield's opinion that the canonical Gospel of St. Matthew is an abridged edition of a larger work, of which fragments still survive, containing more material than is now found in the four Canonical Gospels put together, and that this 'Protevangel' was written in Hebrew, not in Aramaic, and was intended by the Judæan Christians who produced it to become the last book of the Old Testament canon. It would be a difficult thesis to substantiate, but Mr. Schonfield discovers in the early Hebrew MS. which he has translated in the present work indubitable traces, revealed by the early translator's hand, of an underlying Hebrew original of St. Matthew's Gospel. It may even be, he adds, that the Hebrew text of the du Tillet MS. is a descendant of the lost original. In any case, he is persuaded that scholars will now be able to quote the Old Hebrew alongside the Old Latin and Old Syriac among their witnesses to the Sacred Text. It will be for scholars to examine the variants found in the text of the Hebrew Matthew and to formulate their conclusions. In another column we offer a brief critical note on one of the passages in the Hebrew Matthew which Mr. Schonfield adduces in support of his opinion concerning that work.

SPIRITUAL EXERCISES.

There are still vacant spaces in Literature, still things waiting to be done, and books that ought to be written. Here, for example, is an idea long overdue worked out at last, and that with competence, if in a somewhat compressed form—a study of the spiritual exercises of the great religions—Hindu, Buddhist, Muhammadan, Christian. The title is *Spiritual Exercises and their Results*, by Miss Aelfrida Tillyard (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d. net). It does not need the impressive list of scholars who have helped Miss Tillyard to let any one at all familiar with this region of things see that she writes with carefully garnered knowledge; and she makes an impressive study. Sometimes, just where we hope for light, she fails us—on the Buddhist Aruppas, for example. And little wonder; for there she is in virgin forest, where no track is cut for us as yet. But usually she is informing, and always sympathetic and understanding. Surely it is profoundly moving to be reminded in this fashion of the pains and toil that earnest people everywhere have taken, and are taking, to keep in touch with Reality, to prevent the obtrusive world around them from choking out the truer things. And surely it is not a little daunting to consider our own haphazard spiritual ways and methods in view of all this concentration of skilled and desperate effort, nowhere more evident than in certain branches of the Christian Church, where folk are giving time and strength and their whole being to their exercises, while we turn in to ours so casually and put them through with such perfunctory haste. Yet one who has striven to apply and use these detailed methods must set it down as his experience, for what that may be worth, that he has found that the simpler the approach to God the nearer does one draw to Him, that all this elaboration of spiritual mechanism, this intricacy of machinery and whirling wheels, leaves his heart cold, abashed, and unhelped. And each of us must find his way into the Presence as he can.

THE HOLY SPIRIT IN ST. PAUL.

Books on the Holy Spirit are apt to be cold and bloodless, dealing more with the abstractions of theology than with the throbbing realities of the religious life. No such charge can be made against

The Holy Spirit in St. Paul, by the Rev. R. Birch Hoyle (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net). It is written in a vivid and pictorial style, which serves to present in a living way the spiritual experiences of St. Paul and of the Primitive Church. This is not to imply that the book is not scholarly. On the contrary, it is a very full and careful treatment of the whole subject. Part I. deals with St. Paul's experiences of the Spirit. Here there is a great deal of first-rate exegetical work. Part II. is a study of St. Paul's idea of the Spirit, with a consideration of the various sources from which certain elements in it may have been derived. The whole is concluded with a chapter on the value for to-day of the Pauline experience. It is a book that may be warmly commended to students of theology.

CHRIST THE WORD.

Dr. Paul Elmer More of Princeton has issued the fifth of his projected series of six volumes on 'The Greek Tradition.' It is called *Christ the Word* (Milford; 18s. net). The series covers eight and a half centuries, from the death of Socrates in 399 B.C. to the Council of Chalcedon in A.D. 451. The first four volumes dealt with Platonism, the Religion of Plato, Hellenistic Philosophies, and the Christ of the New Testament; and the sixth and last volume will deal with a number of general topics such as the comparison of Christianity with its chief oriental rival.

In the present volume, as in the previous volumes, the treatment is historical in a liberal sense. The book is rather a monograph than a history, and aims at showing that the whole course of Greek theology was steadily centred upon the one question of the authenticity and meaning and consequences of the Incarnation. It is a deep, rich, and attractive draught of history that Dr. More offers his readers as he pursues his thesis; and his contention, that if religion is to hold the modern mind it must return from Roman legalism and mediæval scholasticism to the more Hellenic type of theology, is one which is eloquently advocated at the present moment by other writers besides himself.

The work is conceived on semi-popular lines, the style is clear and nervous, and the theological standpoint conservative, but only essentially so, as witness the following quotations: 'Fortunately, beneath all the monistic divagations of theology, the dualism of Plato persisted as the true philosophy of the Church in its worship and religious life. It is even more fortunate that in its Christology the progression in every direction towards the engulfing gloom of metaphysics was blocked by the Definition of Chalcedon'; or again, 'No more vital task confronts the Church to-day than to recognize the urgent necessity of insisting on the unreserved acceptance of the one dogma of the Incarnation as the definite, clear, and common mark of a Christian, while leaving to the conscience of each individual how far he will interpret the accessory articles of faith as literal or symbolical, as fact or poetry.'

CONFIRMATION.

The second and concluding volume of *Confirmation; or, The Laying on of Hands*, by various writers (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net), has now been issued. The first volume dealt with the subject historically and doctrinally; the second volume is practical, giving attention to every aspect of the practical work of dealing with Confirmation candidates. In the first paper Dr. O. Hardman provides a general survey of the whole subject under the headings (1) age, (2) the preparation, (3) the Confirmation day, (4) after-care. The second paper recurs to the question of age, the six following treat of preparation in parish and school, the ninth paper treats of the Confirmation service, and the last three papers of after-care. The purpose of the book is well fulfilled, namely, to provide material for those who are training candidates for Confirmation, whereby they may learn what is best from Anglican, Evangelical, and Anglo-Catholic alike.

Dr. Hardman suggests that, normally, children of from ten to twelve years of age should be presented for Confirmation, but that in view of the Enabling Act of 1919, which allows the inclusion on the parochial electoral rolls of the names of members of the Church of England of the age of eighteen, there should be a solemn service for their admission and reception to adult status and privilege. In the second paper, which is at once wise and instructive on the subject of Adolescence, Dr. Reginald Tribe holds that as a sacrament and a rite Confirmation should take place before puberty, but that the intensive theological and devotional training should be left until about the seventeenth year. In the twelfth paper there is a timely animadversion on the present-day abuse by the educationist of that 'blessed word' adolescent.

From Messrs. Allenson have come seven volumes, each attractive in its own way. One is Dr. Archibald Alexander's new book, *Feathers on the Moor*, and

it is published at the modest price of 5s. net. Dr. Alexander describes his short addresses—there are forty-two in all—'as papers on everyday religion.' They are modern in touch and spirit and they are practical. Dr. Alexander keeps close to daily duty. A characteristic address is the third one, on the text, 'A certain Samaritan, as he journeyed,' where the Samaritan is taken as the ideal business man. 'God needs priests and He needs levites, and He has blessed and owned their labours with abundant recognition. But still more, He needs Samaritans. For the priest only sanctifies the place of worship and prayer, and that is holy already. But he who takes the spirit of the Samaritan into the daily world of business and traffic, makes *that* a holy place, and both serves and worships God there.' The material business of life, then, must not be regarded as a no-man's-land, and participation in the work of the Church out of business hours the only Christian discipleship necessary. The better, though not the easier, way is to serve the Father during and by means of one's ordinary occupation. We can commend these short papers to the minister on account of their suggestiveness, and we can also commend them for devotional reading in the home.

The late Mr. Joseph Bentley, F.R.G.S., had both imagination and wit, and for the edification of his family—eleven sons and daughters—he narrated to them every Sunday evening a fresh exploit of his imaginary hero, 'John the Yorkshireman'—the stories are collected under the title *How to Sleep on a Windy Night* (2s. 6d. net)—and from these exploits he drew many homely lessons. Here, for example, is the story of 'A Haunted House.' John's master, Squire Brookley, occupied an ancient manor house. The belief that the house was haunted caused great annoyance, as no maids could be got to stay. So the Squire consulted John and he promised to help. '"Oh yiss," said John, "aw knaw ha to clear t'sperits aht ov a house."

'A few days later the master called for John.

'"Look, John, you have not replenished the decanters to-day. Go into the cellar and fill them up."

'John retired and presently returned, saying, "There is none, Master."

'"Tut, tut, nonsense. I only got a lot in a fortnight ago," said the master.

'"Well, there's noan in nah," replied John.

'"Oh, there must be," exclaimed the Squire. "Go and look again."

'"It's no use, Surr, aw sal find noan," said John. "Didn't yo tell mi to clear this house ov sperits. Well, aw've searched it from t'attic to t'cellars, an' all sperits aw fun were t'whisky and rum, so aw cleared 'em all aht. Aw temmed every bottle dahn sink."

'The Squire stormed and raved for a considerable time, but eventually he quietened down.

'On calm reflection, he remembered he had given John full authority, and John in his quaint way had been teaching him a needful lesson. He had become conscious that the night-cap habit had been steadily growing on him, and that he had been taking a good deal more than he ought to have done.'

It is a pleasure to see that a number of papers by the Rev. Norman Macleod Caie, M.A., B.D., which have already appeared in the 'British Weekly' and elsewhere have now been collected and published in book form. The title is *The Secret of a Warm Heart* (3s. 6d. net).

Those who want suggestive addresses for boys and girls will find them in *The Bronze Bison*, by the Rev. William Pottinger, M.A., the minister of Bristo U.F. Church, Edinburgh (3s. 6d. net).

The last three volumes are *The Stumbling-Block*, with the sub-title 'A Consideration of Truth and What it Implies,' by the Rev. Ambrose J. Williams, M.A. (3s. 6d. net), and a sixth edition of Dr. Lauchlan MacLean Watt's book of prayer, *By Still Waters* (2s. net), and a reprint of the late F. W. H. Myers' poem, *Saint John the Baptist*. The latter is in the dainty 'Heart and Life' Booklets (1s. net).

The British and Foreign Bible Society and the National Bible Society for Scotland have jointly published the Bible in Esperanto. This is a beautiful volume, on India paper and bound in leather at 8s. 6d. net. It may be had with ordinary paper and cloth binding at 6s., and still more beautiful editions at 12s. 6d. and 20s. net. So far as we can see, the translation is very well done. The Old Testament is the work of Dr. L. L. Zamenhof, the inventor of Esperanto, and the New Testament has been prepared by a Translation Committee under the auspices of the National Congress of Esperanto and the British Esperanto Association, with the Rev. J. Cyprian Rust, Vicar of Soham, as chairman.

The Rev. H. P. V. Nunn, M.A., has issued after five years a second edition of his *Introduction to Ecclesiastical Latin* (Cambridge University Press; 6s. net), a book which was needed and has evidently met the need. It contains a summary of the

Grammar of Ecclesiastical Latin, with examples taken as far as possible from the Vulgate New Testament. While the basis of the Latin which the ecclesiastical writers used was the spoken Latin of their time, their style was as much influenced by that of the Latin Bible as that of the average English writer on religious subjects is by the Authorized Version. This judgment of the author's may be tested by the extracts which are added to his book from nine ecclesiastical writers, beginning with St. Perpetua and ending with Thomas à Kempis.

We are indebted to the University of Chicago Press for the best kind of books on religious education which America sends to us. Many have been reviewed in these columns, and all of them good. The 'Project Principle' in religious education is a highly meritorious American product. And we have just received two books which carry out that principle in a particular direction. They are both entitled *Right Living: A Discussion Course for Girls and Boys*, by Mr. Maurice J. Neuberg (published in this country by the Cambridge University Press and priced each 3s. 9d. net). One volume contains 'Constructive Studies,' and is for the pupils, and the other is a 'Teacher's Manual.' The general idea is to take certain typical experiences in the life of youth, and start from these, dealing with the issues they raise. Full directions are given as to how the discussion may be conducted, literature is suggested, and questions are put. The whole thing is done admirably, and the books may be commended to teachers both of day schools and of Sunday Bible classes. Any teacher who fails to leave an impression with such guidance must be hopeless.

The late Rev. J. P. Struthers was well known for his quiet humour. Messrs. James Clarke & Co. have just published a third volume of stories from 'The Morning Watch,' and very delightful they are with their whimsical turns of thought and old-world flavour. The volume would be worth getting if only for the twelve 'Reasons for not going to Church,' which are reprinted here and which are illustrated in just the right spirit by Mrs. Struthers. The title is *More Echoes from 'The Morning Watch'* (3s. 6d. net).

No one who loves St. Francis, and no one who wishes to know him as he was, should miss *The Lord's Minstrel*, a simple history of St. Francis of Assisi, by Caroline M. Duncan Jones (Heffer; 7s. 6d. net). To begin with, it is a beautiful book externally, in print and binding. Its illustrations, by Estella Canziani, cannot be called anything less than exquisite. The story itself is told with a simplicity and old-world realism that make it a delight. We imagine the book is meant for young people. But people of all ages will rejoice in it, and especially people who are young whatever their years may be.

'Miss Keller is often questioned in public about her religion. She answers briefly, but always longs to say more. And so, when asked to write a book about her religion, she welcomed the opportunity to tell her many friends just what her religious ideals are and where she found them.'

So Mr. Paul Sperry writes in his foreword to *My Religion*, by Helen Keller. As we read the book we find that her religion is Swedenborgianism and that she owes her religious ideas to Mr. John Hitz who, for a time, held the position at Washington of Consul-General for Switzerland. Mr. Hitz met Helen Keller when she was only thirteen years old, and from that time he kept in constant touch with her and her teacher. He introduced her to Swedenborg, and when she wanted to know more of his writings he compiled books of explanations and extracts. And Swedenborgianism has never been more attractively portrayed than here. For Swedenborg's message was the second great revelation in Helen Keller's life. The first was when her teacher, Anne Mansfield Sullivan, first succeeded in teaching her the names of things and she realized that it was possible to communicate with other people by these signs. It was her mental awakening. The second awakening came with Swedenborg's message, which revealed to her the wonders of Nature. Those who love Helen Keller, and they are many, will want to add *My Religion* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net) to 'The Story of My Life' and 'The World I Live In.'

A volume of sermons has been published by A. D. Lindsay, C.B.E., LL.D., Master of Balliol, with the title, *The Nature of Religious Truth* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net). They are unusual sermons. The audience was perhaps a little unusual, for these sermons were all preached in Balliol College Chapel. The subject is unusual. It is Christian doctrine. 'My experience is,' says Dr. Lindsay, 'that there are a great many people nowadays to whom Christian doctrines are neither true nor untrue, but simply meaningless. . . . In such a situation an attempt to make issues and meanings more immediately realizable and to show

what kind of meaning is to be looked for in doctrine may be of service.' The thought in the sermons moves slowly and is restrained, but it is with power and it is the thought of a man in intimate touch with modern problems. One of the sermons, in an abridged form, will be found in 'The Christian Year.'

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have conferred a real boon on the reading public by the issue of their 'People's Library.' Many distinguished writers have contributed distinguished books to it, and all sides of life and literature are represented in it. It will be sufficient to note the appearance of two new volumes (in addition to the 'Life of Jesus Christ,' by Canon Deane, reviewed in another column). *Cromwell: A Character Sketch,* by Mr. John Drinkwater, is one, and to Mr. Drinkwater there is only one person fittingly described as 'Cromwell.' The great Protector has been his hero, he tells us, since his boyhood, and it is in the spirit of this hero-worship the sketch is written. He calls it a 'Character Sketch,' but it is more by far. It gives a great deal of insight into the whole of that situation which we briefly describe as 'Puritanism.' But it all centres on the one outstanding figure, and the book is written with such knowledge, such skill, such ease and humour and vividness, that it is altogether delightful.

The other volume is *St. Teresa,* by Mrs. Cecil Chesterton, a full and devout account of one of the most eminent among the saints. The price of each volume is 2s. 6d. net.

The second issue of *The Expositor's Year Book* has just appeared (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). The general editor is Professor Moffatt, and (as in the former volume) he has had the assistance of Canon Box and Professor T. H. Robinson for the Old Testament, and Professor Fulton for Theology in general. The aim of this publication is to furnish a survey of the work done in theology during the past year, particularly within the departments of Biblical interpretation and exposition. The field has been carefully mapped out into fourteen divisions, and these again into subdivisions, in some cases as many as ten. Magazine articles are not overlooked, and subjects like Comparative Religion, the Psychology of Religion, and Religious Education are included. As an example of the care and thoroughness with which this work is done we may note that articles on Religious Education in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES are mentioned, and we are specially glad to see Miss Helen Wodehouse's excellent book 'The Scripture Lesson in the Elementary School' praised.

It would be impossible to speak too highly of this invaluable guide to religious literature. No side or aspect of it is omitted, and scholars, preachers, and teachers will all find in the 'Year Book' not only reliable information on all matters in which they are concerned, but brief and pointed indications of the gist of books and articles and of their particular usefulness.

For those who are interested in things Jewish a veritable feast of good things is provided in the *Hebrew Union College Annual,* vol. iv. (The Jewish Publication Society Press, Philadelphia, Pa., U.S.A.). Its five hundred odd pages contain sixteen articles (about half of them in German) of which the longest, of one hundred and thirty-eight pages, by Julian Morgenstern, is devoted to 'The Oldest Document in the Hexateuch.' This document is what he calls the K or Kenite document, which, he believes, was one of considerable magnitude and contained the 'Little Book of the Covenant'—the so-called Decalogue in Ex 34^{12-26} usually ascribed to J. This document, Morgenstern believes, and skilfully endeavours to prove, was composed in 899 B.C. in support of the religious reformation of King Asa by the leaders of the prophetic party in Judah in close association with the Rechabites of the Kenite tribe. The most interesting of many interesting suggestions is that in the 'promise, my *panim* shall go with' the people, the allusion is to Hobab, the brother-in-law of Moses. This is a discussion which will have to be reckoned with. Other subjects treated in the volume are the 'Unwritten Law in the Literature of Judaism,' 'Changes in the Divine Service of the Synagogue due to Religious Persecutions,' 'The Matriarchate.' 'The Astrolabe in Jewish Literature,' etc. The volume is full of interest and stimulus. In a second edition the following misprints should be corrected—p. 139, Phil*i*sophie (for *o*), p. 141, philoso*s*phischen (omit *s*), p. 279, ANA (for AND), p. 368, eigen*l*tich (for *tl*), p. 377, schü*l*tze (omit *l*), p. 381, HEBRIÄSCHE (for *AI*), p. 405, veröffent*il*chen (for *li*), p. 433, krit*s*che (for *tis*).

A Popular History of the Baptist Building Fund—1824–1924 (Kingsgate Press; 3s. 6d. net) deserved to be written. It is justly claimed to be 'a romantic story of Baptist Church extension during a period of two centuries,' and its author, Mr. Seymour J. Price, has been at great pains in gathering the facts and presenting the lives of the

leading ministers and laymen who played distinguished parts in it. Here is the outstanding fact in the record: Loans have been granted for a total of over £699,000 for church building and extension. Of this sum only £73 had to be written off as a bad debt!

A very simple *Life of Jesus Christ*, telling the story as it comes, has been written by Mr. W. R. Mitchell and published by Messrs. Sampson Low, Marston & Co. (3s. 6d. net). It is a reversion to the Farrar type of narrative, and probably to many readers, after Mr. Middleton Murry and others, this quiet and vivid tale will be welcome. The special feature of the book, if it has one, is a considerable use of local colour. Of any and every life of Jesus, if only it is truly and reverently done, and from whatever school, one feels inclined to say, 'Let them all come.'

For the moment there must be very nearly enough books on Mysticism. They still pour from the printing-presses; but one may read a score of them, and come on almost nothing that requires or explains their appearance. Here is Professor Rufus M. Jones, Litt.D., D.D., issuing through Messrs. Macmillan & Co. (7s. 6d. net) *New Studies in Mystical Religion*. The author is, of course, a recognized authority, with a delightfully sane mind that is not interested in extravagances, whether mystical or not, and that keeps its eyes firmly on the true end of life. His book is interesting always, partly by its unexpectedness. For one never knows what lies over the page. It may be a lament upon the failure of Sunday schools, or an impressive paragraph upon the Upanishads. But the religion discussed is really not particularly mystical, nor has one reader come on much that sounded very new. The idea is that mystical experience is not a queer oddity of a thing, but rather a part of normal daily life when that is at its healthiest and is most perfectly developed.

Mr. Humphrey Milford has published jointly with the Cambridge University Press a new edition of the Revised Version of *The Apocrypha*. The price of the volume is 6s. net in cloth, and it is also issued in leather bindings at higher prices. It should be noted that there is a special feature in this new edition. For the first time in the history of the Revised Version of the Apocrypha the text is divided into verses.

Speaking with Tongues: Historically and Psychologically Considered, by the Rev. George Barton Cutten, Ph.D., D.D., LL.D., President of Colgate University (Milford; 11s. 6d. net), is a praiseworthy contribution to the elucidation of a difficult problem in the psychology of religion. The author first collects his data, beginning with the experiences of Pentecost and the Pauline description of the Corinthian Church and the other relevant Biblical facts. Then he traverses the records of Fathers and Saints—of the striking experiences among the Huguenots of France, of the various sects, with a particularly interesting account of Edward Irving and his followers, and so right down to the present, not forgetting the similar manifestations outside religion. Without overloading his pages with details, he gives sufficient material to enable him in the last chapter to deal in a calm, judicial spirit with the whole from a psychological standpoint. The matter and method of the book are characterized by diligent research and a scientific spirit, and the very full bibliography at the end of the volume adds considerably to its value. A book, while modestly disclaiming originality, yet of real merit, written in a clear style, lucidly arranged and adequately handling a difficult and obscure subject.

A devout and edifying work on the prayers of Jesus has been written by the Rev. D. M. M'Intyre, D.D., *The Prayer-Life of our Lord* (Morgan & Scott; 3s. 6d. net). It is a book into which the writer has put his best. Dr. McIntyre has been for long engaged in the training of evangelists, and he is, on his own lines, a competent educator. But his peculiar gift is that of a reverent, orthodox, and spiritually minded expositor of Scripture. And in this exposition of one intimate side of the gospel-story he has a task after his own heart.

In a volume entitled *The Proofs of Christ's Deity* (Morgan & Scott; 6s. net), the author, Mr. Harold E. Gorst, claims that the evidence for the Deity of Jesus Christ is so strong that it would be accepted in any Court of Justice. But all that he himself attempts to do is to expound the miraculous or marvellous incidents of Christ's life as recorded in the Gospels; at any rate that is all he succeeds in doing. His work, it should be added, shows careful study of the English Bible.

The Religious Tract Society are to be congratulated on their enterprise, and Russian scholars should note that they can now obtain from them *A Russian Concordance to the Holy Scriptures*. The volume

contains one thousand two hundred and seventy-seven pages. It is well printed and strongly bound, and the Society are selling it for the modest sum of 15s. net.

In *The Transition from Aristocracy, 1832–1867* (Seeley, Service; 12s. 6d. net), Mr. O. F. Christie, M.A., covers a period in our national history that has been dealt with already in many biographies, including those of Queen Victoria and the Prince Consort and of nearly all her many Prime Ministers. Mr. Christie's purpose, however, has been to set forth the conditions preceding and succeeding the passing of the Reform Act of 1832 and the political and social changes that followed 'a greater revolution than that of 1688.' He has written a candid, frank, and illuminating narrative, and those who are most inclined to take a pessimistic view of present conditions in religious, political, and social life may perhaps take heart again when they look back on the way by which we have escaped from the land of bondage as if by the way of a forty years wandering in the wilderness. Those who dread the advancing tide of democracy, and especially those whose flesh creeps at the thought of 'votes for flappers,' need to be reminded of the conditions under which we, the people of Great Britain, lived under the sway of aristocracy, the sole owners of rotten boroughs, nearly a century ago. Let them note how slow and deliberate the approach has been to a fully enfranchised democracy. But what of the supposed decline and failure of the influence of religion during this period? It is the fashion to belittle the Victorian era. Here we have a comparison with the aristocratic era that preceded it, and we must stand amazed at, and give God thanks for, the magnitude of the change for the better, in both Church and State. We have the aristocracy still with us, but with a notable difference, for, as George Meredith tells us, 'We English have ducal blood in business: we have royal blood in common trades. For all our pride we are a queer people; and you may be ordering butcher's meat of a Tudor, sitting on the cane-bottomed chairs of a Plantagenet.'

At this mid-winter season there is no more agreeable way of spending a summer holiday in imagination than to occupy an easy-chair by the fireside with one of Messrs. Seeley, Service & Company's handy and beautifully illustrated volumes on 'Things Seen.' Thus 'is the winter of our discontent made glorious summer.' Here is a choice between *Things Seen in Switzerland in Summer*, by Mr. Douglas Ashby; *Things Seen in North Wales*, by Mr. W. T. Palmer; *Things Seen in the Pyrenees*, by Captain Leslie Richardson; *Things Seen at the Tower of London*, by Mr. H. Plunket Woodgate; and at the cost of 3s. 6d. you may be at once transported to the midst of the finest scenery in Europe. There are now about thirty of these pocket guide-books, all of them written by men familiar with the ground and having an intimate knowledge of the scenes they describe. Those who have been there, those who contemplate a holiday tour, and those who are content to sit at home at ease will alike find an abundant pleasure in the company of the writer of one of these little volumes. The illustrations are fittingly chosen to justify the descriptive matter.

In an able and vigorous little work, *The Son of Zebedee and the Fourth Gospel* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net), the Rev. H. P. V. Nunn, M.A., contends for the apostolic authorship of the Fourth Gospel. His dissertations, which are largely negative and critical, seek to clear the way for the possibility of apostolic authorship by throwing doubt upon the story, popularized among us by Dr. Moffatt and Dr. Charles, of the early death by martyrdom of John, the Son of Zebedee. Much attention is given to Canon Streeter's discussion, in his book on the the Four Gospels, of the authorship and value of the 'Johannine' Gospel. It is maintained that by attributing the Gospel to the 'Elder,' while at the same time finding but a slight connexion between the 'Elder' and the Beloved Disciple, Canon Streeter has led us into a 'morass of improbabilities.' In a Foreword to the work, the Bishop of Manchester expresses sympathy with the author's aim and intention.

A life of St. Paul under the curious title *A Bondman of the Lord*, written by H. S. C. E., has been published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (4s. 6d. net). The apology for its appearance by the writer, that St. Paul had been her hero from girlhood, is disarming. And one can only say of this that even a new life of the Apostle can be pardoned to one who loves him so ardently, for that is the main qualification for understanding him. There is nothing new in the biography. It is based on Conybeare and Howson, Farrar, Ramsay, Rackham, and McNeile—a goodly company of guides. But the story is well told, and no one can go far wrong who takes this writer as a companion. Some sentences show that she is of the High Church persuasion.

After the story of Paul's conversion and commission in Damascus we have, 'His Baptism and his first Communion followed . . . then, cleansed from sin, and strengthened, he was a member of the Christian body.' And of James, 'the Lord's brother,' we read that 'this is best taken to mean a child of Joseph by a former wife.' The book is embellished by many maps and pictures, one of which is specially vivid, a wood-cut of a ship in a storm, to illustrate St. Paul's shipwreck.

Rationalism and Orthodoxy of To-day, by the Rev. J. H. Beibitz, M.A. (S.C.M.; 5s. net), is a work of real ability and learning. The main thesis is that 'the Christian philosophy of the universe, based on the doctrine of the Logos, is a wholly intelligible and coherent scheme of thought. It explains, as nothing else does, the central mystery of the rationality of the universe, or, in other words, the kinship between the universe and the human mind. Thus it is admirably fitted to become the permanent metaphysic of natural science.' Perhaps an undue amount of space is given to criticism of the views of Mr. Julian Huxley in his 'Essays of a Biologist,' but the writer's conviction is that some such form of rationalism as is there so persuasively set forth is for the modern mind the only possible alternative to the Christian system.

The Muhammadan Agrapha.

By the Reverend R. Dunkerley, B.A., B.D., Cambridge.

The publication of the second part of Professor Asin's study of the sayings ascribed to Jesus Christ ('Agrapha') in Muhammadan writings provides a suitable occasion for a comprehensive review of this whole question. A complete survey of it has never previously been made.

I.

That there are numerous references to Jesus in the Quran is, of course, well known to all who have any acquaintance with that book or with the history of Islam. But the kinship of most of the passages with the Apocryphal Gospels of the infancy and boyhood of Jesus is so evident and the facts narrated so out of harmony with the Canonical Gospels that they have been generally ignored in studies of the agrapha.

The only extract that I can regard as at all interesting in this connexion is the following portion of a proclamation by Jesus of His purpose in coming:

> 'And I come to confirm the law which was revealed before me, and to allow unto you as lawful, part of that which hath been forbidden you; and I come unto you with a sign from your Lord; therefore fear God and obey me. Verily God is my Lord and your Lord; therefore serve him. This is the right way. But when Jesus perceived their unbelief, he said, Who will be my helpers towards God?
>
> 'The Apostles answered, We will be the helpers of God; we believe in God, and do thou bear witness that we are true believers. . . .' [1]

This may be merely an imaginative reference to the gospel story based upon knowledge of the Canonical records, but one or two points may be noticed. It is very awkwardly introduced—as part of the Annunciation, in fact, and it is differently quoted in two separate parts later on (Suras 43, 61). This suggests that a document in another language lay in the background, but inasmuch as it relates to a part of the life of Jesus not commonly dealt with in the Apocryphal Gospels—at least those of the type with which Muhammad appears otherwise to have been familiar—the possibility must be considered that he was in touch with some less fantastic source of some kind. The thought of the passage is perhaps nearer the Gospels than a first glance might suggest; the opening sentence reminds us of Mt 5^{17}, and its practical outcome as regards the Sabbath (Mk 3^{4}, etc.), the question of food (Ac 10^{9-16}, 1 Co 10^{23}), etc.; 'my Lord and your Lord' is not very far from Jn 20^{17}; while 'fear God and obey him' crystallizes the teaching of many passages and is in itself a fine precept.

Most writers on the agrapha have entirely neglected the Quran. The few exceptions may just be noticed. The American scholar, Bernhard Pick, includes part of this in one of his studies, without expressing any opinion about it, however; he also adds the two alternative versions of it

[1] Sura 3 (Sale's translation).

mentioned above, and three other much more legendary extracts.[1] J. H. Ropes rather strangely finds room not for this but for one of those fantastic passages, the 'Table from heaven' story, which seems clearly a perversion of the Feeding of the Multitudes, confused with the Last Supper.[2] Rudolph Hofmann does the same, and also includes a tale from one of the commentators of the Quran regarding the raising of Shem.[3] These are the only references I have traced.

The much more important question with which we have to deal is that of the sayings attributed to Jesus in the *Hadith* or traditional literature of the Muhammadans, especially in books by ascetic writers. The earliest notice of these dates from 1644, when Levinus Warnerus—cited hereafter as LW—included four such passages in his *Centuria Proverbiorum Persicarum*;[4] his purpose in so doing was not to suggest that they had any authenticity or value, but merely to illustrate his remark (à propos of a reputed saying of Alexander the Great) that the Muhammadans were accustomed to add matter which was inconsistent with true history. The only one of these passages that seems worth quoting is the following description of the craving for money:

> 'Whoso craves wealth is like a man who drinks sea-water; the more he drinks, the more he increases his thirst, and he ceases not to drink until he perishes.'

The next reference to these extracts appears to have been that of Fabricius in the second edition of his *Codex Apocryphus Novi Testamenti* (1719);[5] he borrowed the four just mentioned and added one from the *Gulistan* or *Rose Garden*—a remarkable collection of stories, verses, etc., made in the thirteenth century by Saadi, one of the most famous of Persian poets. It is as follows:

> 'O son of Adam! if I give thee wealth, thou wilt occupy thyself with riches to the neglect of me; and if I make thee poor, thou wilt rest discontented and grieved at heart; and so, how canst thou know the sweet delight of praising me, and when wilt thou haste to worship me?'[6]

This is introduced by the statement, 'It is said in the Gospel,' but it has been thought that Pr 30^{7-9} is the basis of it. Fabricius remarks that these five sayings found amongst the Muhammadans are far better than the references to Jesus in Jewish writings.

Toland, in his quaint work *Nazarenus* (1718), refers to the same four sayings gathered by LW, and suggests that their original location was the 'Gospel of Barnabas,' a copy of which he had examined without, however, having had time to verify this hypothesis. He further remarks: 'I found many sayings ascribed to Jesus by Kesseus (as I read his *Lives of the Patriarchs and Prophets* cited) and by other Muhammadan writers, exprest in this Gospel of Barnabas.'[7] This Kesseus is quoted by Marracci in his edition of the Quran, by Sike in his notes to the *Gospel of the Infancy*, and occasionally by Sale, but I have not been able to verify Toland's statement; it is interesting, however, as showing that the presence of such agrapha was becoming recognized. We must consider presently the 'Gospel of Barnabas.' Jeremiah Jones (1726) replied to Toland's attempt to magnify the importance of this and other apocryphal works, and also quoted the four passages from LW as well as several from the Quran, but clearly considered them of no value.[8]

These same sayings were also included by Hofmann in his work already mentioned (1851), with that from the *Gulistan* and, as we have seen, two legendary narratives. Farrar (1874) referred to these passages as 'striking,' instancing the 'sea-water' saying and one other;[9] Schaff (1882) also mentioned it as the best of the agrapha from this quarter.[10] Most other writers on the agrapha ignored them altogether, including Resch in the first edition of his *Agrapha* (1889).

Meanwhile, in 1849, the remarkable discovery had taken place by Alexander Duff, the Scottish missionary, that on the gateway of the mosque at Futtehpore-Sikri, near Agra—built by Akbar in the sixteenth century—there was written in large letters the statement that Jesus said:

> 'The world is merely a bridge; ye are to pass over it and not build your dwellings upon it.'

This does not appear to have been made public till Duff's 'Life' was published in 1879; his description of it and comment upon it are interesting.[11] It was also described by Miss C. F. Gordon-Cumming in her travel volume, *In the Himalayas*

[1] *Paralipomena*, p. 100.
[2] Hastings' *D.B.*, vol. v. p. 352.
[3] *Das Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen*, ch. 76.
[4] P. 30. [5] Vol. iii. pp. 394–396.
[6] See Platt's Edition of the *Gulistan*, viii, 91.
[7] P. 20.
[8] *A New and Full Method of Settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament*, p. 198 f., p. 568 f.
[9] *Life of Christ*,[2] Excursus xv.
[10] *History of the Christian Church*,[2] p. 167.
[11] See his 'Life,' vol. ii. p. 164.

(1884),[1] and has been frequently referred to since. Asin, with whose important contribution to the question of the Muhammadan agrapha we shall deal shortly, quoted two variant forms of the saying, tracing it back to the seventh century in Arabic literature.[2] David Smith gave an interesting study of it (1913),[3] commenting on the fact that there were no bridges in Palestine, and that the word does not occur in the Bible; he suggested that the saying might nevertheless be genuine and date from the journey made by Jesus and His disciples to Phœnicia (Mk 7^{24}), which would bring them within sight of the famous mole at Tyre. This passage is the only Muhammadan agraphon mentioned by Resch in his second edition (1906), by Griffinhoofe (1903),[4] and by Hennecke in his first study of the agrapha (1904);[5] he oddly cites as his sole authority for it a devotional reference in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (August 1899). Further, it is one of the only two agrapha included under that heading in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*—which fact suggests the measure of neglect this whole study has suffered.

Mention may be made here of the familiar story of the dead dog, scorned by all beholders, to the whiteness of whose teeth Jesus called attention. It has been put into verse by several English writers, the earliest I think, being Miss Ellice Hopkins, who included it in her *Autumn Swallows* (1883); from what source she drew it is not stated. It can be traced back to the eighth century, and will be referred to again below.

II.

We come now to one of the most important contributions made to this subject, the collection of seventy-seven Muhammadan sayings which Professor D. S. Margoliouth published in five instalments in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (November 1893 to September 1894). Amongst these are two of those quoted by LW and the story just mentioned; all the rest are new. Some five or six are of distinctly legendary and even magical tone (a talking skull, for example, and Satan's anxiety at the Nativity); several are statements about Jesus rather than sayings; and a few show clear signs of having been framed for doctrinal reasons in opposition to the thought of Christ's divinity. But in the main they are moral and spiritual precepts like the best of those already quoted, and some at least can quite bear comparison with some of the more familiar agrapha from other sources. All but six of them are from a work called *The Revival of the Religious Sciences*, by Al Ghazzali, one of the finest of the mystical writers of Islam, who lived in the eleventh century, but, of course, drew upon much older sources. I shall not cite any of these passages at the moment, as it will be more useful to do so presently in illustration of various points raised.

Unfortunately Margoliouth simply gave the sayings without any criticism or estimate of them. His views may, however, be gathered from two references elsewhere. There is, first of all, a brief note in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (December 1906) in which he says: 'Most of the sayings attributed by Moslem writers to Jesus are either deliberate inventions, or owe their ascription to a lapse of memory.' He then quotes an odd passage which he thinks cannot be explained in this way, but was probably in the Gospel used by some heretical sect in the story of the Last Supper; it need not be cited, as it appears quite fictitious, but Margoliouth's acknowledgment that sayings may have been thus borrowed should be noted. His second reference to the question is in an article entitled 'Christ in Mohammedan Literature,' which he and Sell jointly contributed to *D.C.G.*[6] In the course of this, it is stated that 'the Moslem sermon ordinarily consists largely of anecdotes and maxims connected with persons of eminence, . . . In the works of these writers the name of Isa figures very frequently, the sayings and doings assigned to him being sometimes traceable to the Gospels, but often assigned in different works to a variety of persons.' The implied caution about accepting these sayings is obviously of great importance, but, as his previous remark shows, it must not be so pressed as to exclude the possibility that elements drawn from other sources may not also be included. With reference to divergent ascription, there are other explanations in certain instances than the one hinted at; and it may also be remarked that in the majority of cases these sayings are not attributed to several speakers.

Margoliouth's collection of sayings was passed in review in the *Expositor* (February 1894), by Lock, who wrote, however, with only three of the five instalments before him. His opinion of them was not high, as may be gathered from the following extracts: 'By far the greater number contain

[1] P. 155. [2] See Nos. 46 and 75 in his list.
[3] *Unwritten Sayings of our Lord*, pp. 71–82.
[4] *The Unwritten Sayings of Christ*, p. 128.
[5] *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, p. 10; *Handbuch*, p. 17.
[6] Vol. ii. pp. 882 f. (1908).

wise, shrewd, kindly advice, such as finds its analogy in the sayings of the Jewish Fathers rather than in the Gospels. They are the utterances of a teacher of knowledge rather than of the revealer of life. Others have a far stronger ascetic tendency than is to be found in the Gospels; they seem to have passed through a monastic channel before reaching Mohammedanism. . . . Others have parallels in the Gospels, but seem to be scarcely more than reminiscences of them. . . . They are a striking illustration of the way in which tradition runs riot when left to itself for centuries.' Many of these remarks are sound; there can be no doubt that paraphrases of Gospel passages or hearsay reports of them are included, and the influence of monasticism is also evident. But is not the question rather whether other factors did not contribute something as well, and some fragments (possibly very few in number) of teaching survive thus which would otherwise have been lost? It may perhaps be suggested, too, that no strict line can be drawn between 'wise, shrewd, kindly advice' and the 'revelation of life'; they are too closely interlinked for sharp definition, and many isolated precepts in the Gospels might well be ranked in the former class. Moreover, as regards the asceticism of some of these sayings, there is certainly something to be said—as we shall see—for the idea that there was a larger element of this kind in the teaching of Jesus than has been commonly supposed; if this is so, some importance may well attach to these Muhammadan agrapha, where this is so stressed.

Very inadequate notice seems to have been paid to Margoliouth's work by writers on the agrapha. Resch ignored it in the second edition of his book (1906), as also the Muhammadan agrapha generally, with the one exception (as we have seen) of the 'bridge' saying, which he thought of no value. Several other writers neglected this question altogether. Ropes (1904), in the article already quoted, included the first forty-eight of Margoliouth's collection, apparently unaware of the two last instalments, which contained twenty-nine others;[1] he added two from LW, one of which he would have found in the residue from Margoliouth, and, as we have already mentioned, he also included one odd passage from the Quran. Pick, in his various lists of agrapha, made some use of LW's sayings, and in his fullest collection (1908) found room also—as stated above—for six passages from the Quran, but makes no mention of Margoliouth. Donehoo, in his *Apocryphal and Legendary Life of Christ* (1902), was indebted to Ropes (by private correspondence) for his knowledge of Margoliouth's collection, and therefore, like him, omitted a large part of it; he added several others (including those from LW), but the only novelty is a passage which is clearly a perversion of Jn $3^{3.4}$. Others also have followed Ropes in missing part of the available material and referring without explanation to three-fifths only of what Margoliouth gathered; Gwilliam in *D.C.G.*[2] does so, but only quotes one saying (No. 19); strangely enough, Margoliouth and Sell, in the article already cited, refer in the same way to part only of the former's earlier gleanings. It may just be added that this common error is not due to the sayings of lesser authenticity or interest being ignored, as Margoliouth quotes them in order from Al Ghazzali's work; it is solely a question of missing the last two instalments because a few months elapsed before their publication.

Several studies regarding the connexion of Christianity and Islam appeared about this time, without contributing much to our subject, however, and rather oddly without making reference to Margoliouth's compilation. In 1910, Claud Field, in two interesting appendices to his *Mystics and Saints of Islam*, discussed the way in which Christian tradition has influenced Muhammadan writers, stressing especially the fact that Gospel passages are often ascribed to Muhammad instead of to Jesus. While not quoting any sentences that we can call actual agrapha, he gives several that are clearly paraphrases of Gospel passages and also a versified form of the tale of the dead dog mentioned above; this is based on a poem by Nizami, the Persian poet, who flourished in the twelfth century. In 1912, Zwemer's *The Moslem Christ* appeared; it is an important work, which shows conclusively the amazing growth of legend and the extraordinary fertility of imagination amongst early Muhammadan writers. Abundant evidence is adduced to prove both that stories and sayings of Jesus were transferred to Muhammad and that tales were freely invented about both. But on our particular side of the subject he is not helpful. He quotes eight sayings[3] attributed to Jesus and a form of the skull story, all of which P. L. Cheikho included in his *Quelques Legendes Islamiques Apocryphes* (Beirut, 1910). These sayings are not striking and will not be before us again; the first of them is:

'Hope if ye be afraid, and be afraid if ye hope.'

[1] Hastings' *D.B.*, vol. v. pp. 350–352.

[2] Article, 'Sayings (Unwritten),' vol. ii. p. 575.

[3] See p. 144.

Taken by itself Zwemer's book would give the impression that there are very few Muhammadan agrapha, and that what there are can make no claim at all to embody any valuable material. He gives a useful bibliography of works on the general question, which, however, it is unnecessary to mention here since they contain no agrapha.

One point arises out of some of the facts just adduced. Remembering that Gospel sayings and doings are frequently found in the Hadith literature attributed to Muhammad, is it not conceivable that in some cases of divergent ascription of non-evangelical matter the same process has taken place and the same motive operated—a desire, perhaps, to gain kudos for the prophet or one of his followers? At any rate, there ought not to be an assumption that the opposite proceeding has always obtained, and that the ascription to Muhammad is the more original. In some instances, the date of the opposing witnesses is important; for example, a variant of the 'bridge' agraphon is found as a saying of Muhammad, but not before the eleventh century.[1]

[1] See Asin's work referred to below, p. 369.

A small addition to our material was made in 1916 by A. Mingana, who published, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for May, three agrapha which he had found in a rare Arabic work of the thirteenth century called *The Book of the Beautiful Admonition.* One of these should perhaps hardly be included, since it occurs in the Quran as what Jesus will say to God at the last day. The following is more useful:

> 'O Doctors and Teachers of the Law! You have sat down in the way to the world to come; you do not walk in it yourselves in order to reach heaven, and you do not permit others to walk in it and to reach heaven. But the ignorant is more excusable than the learned.'

Mingana refers to Margoliouth, and appears not to rule out the possibility of some valuable elements being found in such passages. 'To say that they have simply been invented,' he says, 'by the writers who quoted them is an hypothesis which does not seem to be very attractive.'

(*To be concluded.*)

The American Translation of the Old Testament.[1]

By Professor J. A. Selbie, D.D., United Free Church College, Aberdeen.

Much has been done in recent years to make the Old Testament more intelligible and interesting to English readers. The Revised Version did much, and, but for the restrictions under which the translators worked, would have done much more, to secure this end. The need for more work of the kind and the growing interest in the Old Testament have been abundantly evidenced by the welcome given in many quarters to Dr. Moffatt's translation; and we feel sure that the appearance of this American translation will be hailed as a boon on both sides of the Atlantic.

When we read in the Preface that 'Our guiding principle has been that the official Massoretic text must be adhered to as long as it made satisfactory sense,' we were a little afraid lest the translation might show the same imperfections as are exhibited by the R.V. text when compared with its marginal renderings. Happily this fear has proved to be to a very large extent groundless. No doubt the four distinguished scholars, the result of whose labours has now been given to the world, are convinced that, in some instances, their translation of the official Hebrew text, although intelligible, does not represent the true original. At the same time the ninety-one closely printed pages of 'Textual Notes,' showing the departures from the Massoretic text, are a sufficient indication that the translators have felt themselves free to give a considerable latitude to their instructions.

We have nothing but admiration for the form of the printed page, which is like that of an ordinary book. We venture to think that nothing has done more to repel readers of the Bible as literature than the printing of it in double columns. Space may thus be saved and the cost of production reduced, but these gains are dearly bought. In the present

[1] *The Old Testament: An American Translation.* By Alex. R. Gordon, Theophile J. Meek, J. M. Powis Smith, Leroy Waterman. Edited by J. M. P. Smith (University of Chicago Press, $7.50; and Cambridge University Press, 37s. 6d. net).

volume not only have we admirable paragraph divisions, but the text runs across the whole page, and in the case of dialogues a new line is given to each speaker, as in a modern novel. This has inevitably swollen the translation to over sixteen hundred pages, but we feel sure that the methods adopted will make the Old Testament a more readable book than it has ever been. The reader is greatly helped also by the well-chosen headings which are freely interspersed in the different sections, while the distinction between prose and poetry is indicated typographically. In this way those who have no acquaintance with Hebrew poetry are enabled to form some conception of the balance and the rhythm of the original when, as so often in the writings of the Prophets, not to speak of books like Psalms and Job, a poetical structure is introduced.

The present writer shares a widely cherished prejudice against much of what passes on the other side of the Atlantic for English, and he began the perusal of the present volume with a dread lest the purity of language to which the A.V. has accustomed us might have suffered through the intrusion of Americanisms. Here, again, we have been agreeably disappointed. In this country, it is true, we should not say that 'Pharaoh hitched up his chariot,' but that is a comparatively trifling matter, and there are not many expressions like this. We are glad, too, to observe that the Garden of Eden remains a garden and has not become a park, and that the ark of Noah has not been transformed into a barge. A more serious fear was not unnatural, namely, that we might encounter expressions unworthy of the dignity of Scripture. While the present translation is singularly free from such blemishes, we have noted a few that we think might have been avoided. We mention only two. The first of these unfortunately occurs very early in the volume and might easily create a prejudice against the translator at the very outset. Gn 3^8 is rendered: 'They heard the sound of the LORD God taking a walk in the garden for his daily airing.' Not only does this jar upon our ears, but it is not a correct translation of the Hebrew original. Again, in Gn 25^{30}, Esau says to Jacob: 'Let me have a swallow of that red stuff there.' It may be argued that this form of expression is justified by the principle laid down in the Preface that 'if the original be trivial, commonplace, and prosaic, the translation must take on the same character.' Perhaps so, but——

One of the points to which one naturally turns with interest concerns the way in which the Divine name, the Tetragrammaton, is treated. We fancy it is now universally recognized that a very serious mistake was made by Dr. Moffatt when he adopted 'the Eternal' as the equivalent of JHWH. More wisely, the American translators have practically adhered to the course followed by the E.VV., which usually have 'the LORD.' But is even this entirely satisfactory? There is no getting over the fact that JHWH was practically the *personal* name of Israel's God, and in certain passages it is only by introducing a personal name that justice is done to the original. Take two typical illustrations. Ex 6^2 is thus rendered by Dr. Moffatt: 'I am the Eternal; I appeared unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as God Almighty; but I never made myself known to them as "the Eternal."' Comment on this is needless. The American translation reads: 'I am the LORD; I appeared unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as God Almighty, but did not make myself known to them by my name Yahweh [the LORD].' Surely this proves, as Professor Meek by his rendering implicitly admits, that the passage loses its force unless the personal name is introduced. Or take 1 K 18^{19}, where, at the end of the conflict on Mount Carmel, the people cry, 'The Eternal is God, the Eternal is God' (Moffatt), or, 'The LORD, he is God, the LORD, he is God' (American tr.). Why did not Professor Waterman render, 'Yahweh [in contrast with Baal], he is God'? We venture to suggest that in a good many other instances the American translators would have done well to introduce the name 'Yahweh,' or (preferably, in a popular work) the familiar, if artificial, name 'Jehovah.'

The present translation is the work of four scholars, each of whom is primarily responsible for his own part. Old Testament scholars are very familiar with the names of two of them, Professor A. R. Gordon of Montreal, and Professor J. M. P. Smith of Chicago. The other two, whose names are perhaps less familiar, are Professor T. J. Meek of Toronto, and Professor L. Waterman of Michigan. The work of translation has been assigned as follows:

PROFESSOR MEEK . .	The Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, Song of Songs, Lamentations.
PROFESSOR WATERMAN.	Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther.
PROFESSOR SMITH . .	Job, Psalms, Ecclesiastes, the Twelve Minor Prophets.

PROFESSOR GORDON . Proverbs, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel.

We have read a large part of the work of Professors Meek and Waterman, and have examined crucial passages in both; and, whether one always agrees with their renderings or not, one cannot but recognize that a strong case can be made out in their favour, and we feel that we are in the hands of thoroughly competent scholars. Both of them have done excellent work in their translations of the Pentateuch and the Historical Books, and we should like to congratulate Professor Meek on his fine translation and division of the Song of Songs.

The most important, as well as the most difficult, part of the work has been distributed between Professor J. M. P. Smith and Professor A. R. Gordon, and it could not have been put in better hands. Not to speak of other services rendered by Professor Smith, he is already very favourably known from his commentaries on some of the Minor Prophets in the 'I.C.C.' Hence we turn with confidence to his translation of all the Twelve, and our expectations are fulfilled. For instance, he has done everything possible to help towards the understanding of the great prophet Hosea, whose message has frequently been almost meaningless to readers of the A.V. The translation of the Psalter is a crucial test, which we feel fairly confident Professor Smith will be generally considered to have passed well. Perhaps a few of the verbal changes made without altering the meaning of the A.V. might have been dispensed with. He has upon his side a great weight of scholarship in the instances where he departs from renderings that have been endorsed by associations of long-standing. In a great many of these we are at one with him, but he will pardon us for saying that we are persuaded that, like Dr. Moffatt, he has destroyed the value of the 73rd Psalm by rendering v.[24], 'By thy counsel thou leadest me; and by the hand thou dost take me after thee.' A careful study of this psalm has convinced the present writer that the real meaning of that verse is given in Professor McFadyen's rendering: 'By a plan of Thine Thou guidest me, and *wilt afterward take me to glory*.' The Book of Job has, thanks to the labours of many scholars, had at last something like justice done to it, and its understanding and appreciation will be greatly helped by Professor Smith's brilliant translation.

Professor Gordon needs no introduction to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. His services in all departments of Old Testament study have gained him a foremost place among Semitic scholars. Having read the whole of the translations entrusted to him in the present volume, we have no hesitation in saying that by these he has laid us under a new obligation. We knew that he was thoroughly at home with the Prophets, and his translations of Proverbs and Daniel show the hand of a master also of the Ḥokhma and the Apocalyptic Literature. In following him we feel ourselves on sure ground. Not only does his work reach the high-water mark of scholarship, we have not encountered a single expression which seemed to offend against either good English or good taste. He has succeeded admirably in his rendering of Isaiah, notably in such testing passages as the dirge on the king of Babylon in ch. 14 and the famous Servant passage, Is 52^{13}–53. And what shall we say of his translation of Jeremiah? No higher praise could be given than the expression of our conviction that this translation and the way in which it is presented on the printed page ought to set the personality and the work of Jeremiah in a clearer light than before, and to gain a popularity hitherto too often withheld for the works of one who is regarded by most Old Testament scholars as the greatest of the prophets. We do not envy Professor Gordon the task he had to face in translating the Book of Ezekiel, whose obscurity of thought is often aggravated by the corrupt condition of its text. But here, as well as in Proverbs and Daniel (from whose pages 'Messiah' as a proper name rightly disappears), he has very adequately responded to the call made upon him. The sound scholarship and sane judgment which underlie all Professor Gordon's work find their complement in the present volume in a corresponding felicity of expression.

Perhaps we may close by noting one or two minute but important changes on the A.V. (all selected from Professor Gordon's translations). In Is 9^{6} we have 'godlike hero' for the misleading 'Mighty God' (strangely retained by the R.V.). In Is 20^{1} 'Field Marshal' has taken the place of the E.VV. 'Tartan,' which in our boyhood had suggestions connected with a kilt. In Jer 51^{59} the mysterious 'quiet prince' is no longer a Serene Highness but has become a 'quarter-master.' In Ezk 11^{16} 'a little sanctuary' becomes 'little of a sanctuary.' Some will grudge the loss of the old familiar phrase, but the change will commend itself to Hebrew scholars.

The University of Chicago, the editor and his fellow-translators, the publishers and the printers, are all to be congratulated on the production of a volume so worthy of its great subject.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

On Making the Best of it.

By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

'It is good for me that I have been afflicted.'—Ps 119[71].

Do you know why a whin has got its thorns and prickles? No! you say snappily, and I don't want to know, the horrid thing! Other flowers are generous, they'll share with you, they'll give you all they have. But this old miser won't spare anything to any one if he can help it. Halvers! we say. Not likely, he replies, and hugs close all the flowers he has. And yet if a boy acted like that every one would think him mean and selfish. Give me a little bit, then, we say pleadingly, only a little—just one spray. But, no, he won't! And if you try to get it, he'll likely scratch your hands and tear your clothes—the cross old curmudgeon.

Ah! but you mustn't talk about the whin like that. For it's really one of the bravest of things. It has faced up to difficulties that would have beaten most of us. But it wouldn't give in, and stuck it out; and it has come through it all right nobly.

The whin was set to grow in dry places, where there wasn't much water, sometimes almost none at all. And leaves need water. So the whin used to give and give and give any there was to its leaves, until it had none left for itself, and so it died. And then, of course, the leaves died too, and it seemed that very soon there would be no whins left in all the world.

Well, that wasn't any use, was it? Mother is always doing things for you wee ones. But when she tires herself out, and has to take to bed, it's horrid; and you wish she hadn't done so much before. So here, if the whin died, the leaves died with it. But at last it found out a way to manage. Leaves need water, and we have almost none, it said. Well, then, we just can't have many leaves, that's all. We'll have prickles instead. For prickles, you see, don't need water. It won't be nearly so nice, said the whin. My cousin the broom, with its long green shoots, will look much prettier than I. And my friend the cherry tree, with all that lovely blossom, can have leaves as well. Ah, well, I can't, except a few! But it's no use grumbling, and we must make the best of things; so we'll just do without, and have thorns, mostly, instead.

It's like Mother. Sometimes she would love to stay in bed of a morning. It would be fine, she feels, to have a real long lie for once. But what would you do, about breakfast, and getting off to school? So up she gets. And she would like pretty things; but you need this and that, and they have to come first. And at night she's sleepy and would be so glad to get off to bed. But there's stockings to darn and that pair of breeks of yours will have to be patched or you'll fall through and out of them, and that won't do! So up she sits, while you are fast asleep. Just so the whin gave up most of its leaves. I must think of the flowers, it said, and not mind if I look rather plain beside the other plants about me. It made the best of things.

Now, what about you? You get a hard lesson, and do you pout and sulk and throw the book away, crying, 'I can't do it'? Or you want something, and you don't get it. And do you go moping and cross from room to room, 'I don't want this; I won't have that'? Or do you make the best of things, and try to have a good time even without that thing you wished so much? You get a kick at rugger, and you won't play. Oh, look here, that won't do, you know! We have a saying, 'Be a man.' I think we might say, 'Be a whin, and stand up to things, and make the best of them, even when you don't get all your own way.' A rhododendron is a coward and a sulk. When it can't get water its leaves all droop, and it's so sorry for itself, and it lets every one see how wretched it is. But a whin keeps cheery and brave. No water? Ah, well, no leaves for me, that's all, or only a few. But we'll manage. And, do you know, it's just because it's been brave that it's managed better than most plants. Beasts trample down those others, but they don't go far into a jaggy whin bush! Cows eat up many leafy things, but not much of a prickly whin! And so because it's made the best of things, it's let alone, and spreads, and grows and sows itself everywhere. And if you take the knocks of life in the right way, you, too, will be the better for them, will learn to stand on your own feet, will grow brave and unselfish and strong. It's a good thing, says the Psalmist, I have been knocked about a bit. It has taught me heaps of things I wouldn't be without. It's turned out well for me there was so little water, says the whin. I've grown prickles, and can hold my own now. Yes, though I didn't like it at the start at all, it has turned out really well. Stand

up to things, even to horrid, vexing, disappointing things, and they will make a man of you.

Walking or Sauntering.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

'He stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem.'—Lk 9^{51}.

What a wonderful sight a crowded street in a great city is! One wonders what they are all doing, where they are all going, what they all are thinking about. That, of course, you cannot tell or guess; but it is easy to distinguish two sorts of people—those who have a purpose, and those who have not.

Those who have a purpose you can tell by their walk. They go straight forward, nothing turns them aside. They don't stop to look into shop-windows. You can tell them by their speed: they don't dawdle, they lose no time. You can tell them by their faces; they are 'set.' They are thinking about their business. Their minds are not empty, they are full of something.

So the New Testament tells us that Jesus 'set his face stedfastly to go to Jerusalem.' That means that we could see at a glance that Jesus was not just out for a stroll, not caring where He went. He was not just seeing the country, and ready to turn down any lane that looked inviting. There was purpose in His face and in His walk.

I have a friend whom every one likes and who was very popular among the company of visitors at a certain holiday place in the Highlands. A lady there said to his wife, 'What a pleasant smile your husband has for everybody.'

'Oh,' she replied, 'you should see him with his city face!'

One day in winter this lady said to her husband, 'Now I know what Mrs. —— means by her husband's city face. I met him in the city to-day and stopped him and spoke to him. Oh! I wish I hadn't. How serious and stern he was!'

'What on earth did you do that for?' said her husband. 'He was busy. He would be going to a meeting and thinking things over as he went. You shouldn't have stopped him.'

'I suppose you're right,' she said, 'I'll know better next time.'

So you can tell the busy people. Their faces are set, they walk in a business-like, purposeful fashion and you don't want to stop them.

But there are others. They drift along. They stop at shop-windows. They hesitate at corners. It's all one to them which street they go along, and chance will settle it for them. Plainly they have no aim. They don't walk; they just saunter.

Do you know the derivation of the word 'saunter'? There was once a time when it was a great mark of devotion to go on pilgrimage to the Holy Land. In France the Holy Land was La Sainte Terre. People willingly helped the pilgrims on their way, and, of course, some crafty folk saw in this their chance of an easy life. They would ask food and drink at a house, and when asked where they were going, they answered, 'à la sainte terre,' and willingly good people gave them food and shelter for the sake of their holy purpose.

But they had no intention of going to the Holy Land; and people got to know it, and when they saw them coming, they said, 'Here come some more "sainte-terrers."' They were not Christian pilgrims; they were just 'sainte-terring.' And so, some say, the word 'saunter' was born.

It is just the same on the great highway of life. There are those who have a purpose and show it in their walk. There are also those who saunter. They have no aim. They just drift with every current of custom, or of company, or of opinion. They may go to church, if some one calls in and invites them. They may equally go a walk, if some one calls and asks them. They will sit still, if a friend drops in and suggests sitting still. They are saunterers, very agreeable, but making nothing of their lives. The king of saunterers was Charles II. He made sauntering popular, and he was one of the worst kings England ever had, and England paid dearly for her sauntering king.

In our great cities there are a multitude of temptations that beset saunterers. There are all sorts of pests who never think of speaking to men who are plainly bent on business, set on some purpose; but they mark the saunterers and spread their net for them.

To have a purpose in life is a splendid armour against many temptations to evil. Weeds seed best in the empty garden, and evil gets easy entry into the empty mind.

To have the highest purpose, to be about your Father's business, is the best armour of all. The busy servants of sin see at once from face and walk that here is a mind that is pre-occupied and there is no entry for anything else.

Our Lord 'stedfastly set his face to go to Jerusalem.' We must set our faces steadfastly to go to the city of the Heavenly King. There is a hymn that says, 'Whither, pilgrims, are you going?' You have often sung it. Have you an answer to

its question? Are you going anywhere, or are you just sauntering through life?

There is an Irish song which has for its refrain:

I know where I'm going,
And I know who'll go wi' me.

This is a good song to sing, if you are set steadfastly on the pilgrimage to the Heavenly City, and have with you the Great Companion.

The Christian Year.

First Sunday after Epiphany.

The Endless Offering.

'A living sacrifice.'—Ro 12[1].

In studying the life of Christ there may be danger of confining the sacrificial element in it too much to special hours or to the final climax. Faber has a wise warning about this. 'It seems to us strange that our Lord's human life should be of any use to God, except as the instrument of our own redemption. The idea of worship is faint and feeble in our minds. Work, utility, success, palpable results—these are what we look for. Hence we neither habitually see how inexplicable on our principles our Lord's division of His life into thirty years of seclusion and three of active work really is, nor discern the Divine significance of it when it is pointed out to us. We thus do an injustice to His secret, created life of adoration before God.' While the Cross was, in the nature of the case, sacrificial above all that had gone before, His whole life was sacrifice, adoration, worship. It is enough for the servant that he be as his Lord.

1. When we come to New Testament times we find that the Temple sacrifices have vanished into the limbo of things no longer needful. They vanished because Christian men had discovered the sacrificial significance of the Cross. 'Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us.' 'Christ hath loved us and hath given himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God for a sweet-smelling savour.' Here is the sacrifice—priest and victim in one—for which the ages have been waiting, for which the heart of man has unconsciously been looking. Here is the reality of which all that went before is only a symbol and a prophecy. Here is a true sacrifice, perhaps in the full sense the only true sacrifice, not merely a dramatic event designed to have an effect upon men, but an offering laid at the feet of God, to cancel sin and to bring earth and heaven to a meeting-point at last. And so the instincts which had dumbly and brokenly expressed themselves in the earlier sacrifices were satisfied in the Cross, and the sacrificial system of the Temple was laid aside once and for all, as men lay aside a broken tool, an outworn garment. To say this is not to utter dogma or theory: it is to record a fact of history and experience.

2. When Madame Guyon was a child, there was in the large garden of the house in which she lived a chapel to the Holy Child Jesus. She records that in the morning she would often eat only half of her breakfast; she would steal out with the remainder, and lay it in a cavity she had discovered behind the image of the Child Christ, because she wanted to offer sacrifice to her Saviour. Soon, of course, her little store was discovered and the proceedings stopped. But even if she had gone on for a time offering her childish sacrifices she would soon have got beyond them as she grew in knowledge and in grace. She would have discovered that the reality of the Christian's sacrifice is not in anything external but in the heart and the will—its essence in the act and attitude of living, its fragrance in the loving dedication of all life's purposes and powers. So, when we pass from earlier ages and dispensations into the New Testament itself, we watch men coming from a childish and temporary conception of sacrifice to its ethical and reasonable heart. This had been anticipated—'the sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise'—but it had not been generally accepted. And when Paul says, 'I beseech you, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice,' there is a Christian consciousness ripe and ready to receive his words and to confess that this is a reasonable service. God's untold and innumerable mercies make it reasonable. His supreme sacrifice makes it reasonable, and its opposite unreasonable and ungrateful. So the sacrificial element rushes back again, but the external is gone: the ethical, the vital, alone remains.

It is instructive to take a concordance and trace this word 'sacrifice' through the New Testament and see how the central principle leaps to light in many and different ways. The sacrifice is a *living* sacrifice, but life is many-sided and so the sacrifice takes many different forms. Some of the applications of the idea turn themselves Godwards. St. Paul speaks in one place of 'the sacrifice of your *faith*.' Faith is the offering we lay before Him. Like a burnt-offering, it flames. Like incense, it floats. Like smoke, it soars. And God desires to have it at the hands of His children more eagerly

than any fabled deity of long ago desired the sweet savour of burned offerings. Or there is a verse in Hebrews about the sacrifice of *praise*: 'by him let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of lips which make confession to his name.' This lifts the whole matter to a very pure and beautiful region. We recall the cumbrous apparatus of the Temple sacrifice—its reeking altars, its gutters running with blood, its ceaseless symbolism of pain and death. It sublimates the whole matter to learn that words and songs can take the place of such sacrifices and be themselves a sacrifice, because they can help men to carry out the essence of the sacrificial idea, the offering of themselves to God. Sometimes, again, the reference is manward rather than Godward. 'To do good and to share with others, forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased.' There are early Christian documents which speak of the poor as God's altar, but the foundation of that idea was laid in the New Testament itself. The Emperor Titus used to say when a day passed without his doing a kind action, *Diem perdidi*, 'I have lost a day.'

Yet these partial applications of the idea of sacrifice are less than the central principle which includes and transcends them all, and which, when it is accepted by heart and conscience, works out any number of applications for itself. If a man be a *living* sacrifice, so different from the dead sacrifices of long ago, then he carries his own altar about with him: he can find an altar anywhere and everywhere, wherever his will can be yielded to God's will or his powers used for the service of man. If a man himself be a living sacrifice, then his offering is never ended and done with: each day, each hour renews it, for his offering is himself, and he worships not by the clock or by the calendar, but by the motive of his actions and by the intention of his will.

3. When man realizes this ideal in himself, he justifies his place as the crown and climax of the natural process, even if he only fulfils the natural intention by a supernatural grace. Is not this what Nature has been reaching after from the first? Are not her richest moments parables of sacrifice? That wise writer, W. W. Peyton, has a startling phrase in his *Memorabilia of Jesus*, about 'the sorrow of summer.' Is not summer the season of joy and fruit and light? What has summer to do with sorrow? But he explains himself. 'Its large office is to prepare food for the living, and food is essentially a sacrificial offering. The grass is mown down for cattle; the wheat-field is cut down for us; life is given up for the food of others. The cattle are fattened for the slaughter. The midge gives up its life to the swallow, the fry to the gull, the salmon to us. When the activity of plant life goes into flower, growth is arrested; the plant no longer lives for itself but for a new and future plant. Summer is a long sacrificial procession. The system of our world is essentially sacrificial. . . . The whole creation groaneth and travaileth together in pain because the idea of sacrifice is at the base of it.' Then, having so traced the principle which lies at the foundation of the universe, and which puts a stern groundtone even into the music of Nature's merriest, most splendid days, the same writer brings out the principle at the top of the scale, on the human level, on the Christian level. 'We live first not for ourselves, but for God: we live first for others, not for ourselves. We only live for ourselves when we offer ourselves to God to be used up by Him. We only become lucid with life, know what it is to live, when we have lost the idea of mere happiness, and have hold of the idea of service.' Have not men been dimly feeling after that splendid idea, ever since sacrifice became a human institution or a Divine appointment? Did it not shine through many an ancient offering of blood and tears? Was it not the point of many a psalm and prophecy? Did it not shape itself in dreams of God's sacrificial servant who served mankind and won His kingdom only in proportion as His life was yielded up? Did it not help men to interpret the Cross, not as the accident of an hour, but as a part of the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God? Did it not and does it not inspire in earnest souls the thought that until their lives too are offered up they have somehow missed their destiny, they have failed of the perfect worship, of the ineffable and most sacred joy? [1]

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

Woman at Cana.

'Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it.'—Jn 2^5.

What are we to learn from the Epiphany sign of changing water into wine at the marriage feast at Cana in Galilee?

There seem to be four main lessons:

(1) That the ordinary movements of the natural world constitute an affirmation of the Immanence of God. (2) That the identification of Jesus of Nazareth with the control of these movements was His credential for His declaration, 'Ye believe in

[1] J. M. E. Ross, *The Tree of Healing*, 247.

God, believe also in me.' (3) That the influence of woman is emphatically recognized by the Divine Lord as a motive for action. And (4) that human happiness and the fulfilment of the educative purpose of God for His human family lie in implicit obedience to the commands and promptings of the Originating Spirit seeking to realize Himself and manifest Himself through individual lives.

1. Jesus' action at Cana is as though He said: Consider this fruit of the vine. Whence comes it? From a grape which has slowly taken form and swelled and ripened. And whence comes the grape? From a blossom which has gradually expanded under the genial warmth of the sun, and which was fertilized by some busy insect automatically obeying the law of its life. And the blossom? From the vine tree which has shot up from seed or cutting by the wholly unexplained mystery of progressive growth. And the life in the vine tree, whence came that? The memory turns at once to Tennyson's 'Flower in the Crannied Wall.' But why stop there? Tennyson's poetic suggestion leaves you in agnosticism:

> Flower in the crannied wall,
> I pluck you out of the crannies,
> I hold you here, root and all, in my hand,
> Little flower—but *if* I could understand
> What you are, root and all, and all in all,
> I should know what God and man is.

But why stop there? Why not know what God and man is? The scientific method demands an adequate cause for all. The philosophic method demands that there shall be at least as much in the primal cause as in the sum total of its effects. Behind that life in the vine there must be a greater life; and behind that an infinite life, a universal life; and a universal life that proves itself a thousand times over to be an intelligent life, and not a blind, fortuitous concourse of atoms; a life that understands how to combine the mysterious elements of which the world is composed.

In a single glass of water there are six cubic feet of oxygen, reduced to a liquid condition and held there by the continuous action of a force that can only be measured by hundreds of tons. There are other invisible elements around us, carbonic dioxide, nitrogen, hydrogen—elements which, if combined in wrong proportions, would produce disastrous explosions, but all so proportioned, so combined, so securely balanced, that out of them the water, the land, the rocks, the trees, the bodies of living men are formed. And from this splendid spectacle of universal order the laws of logic demand that we should infer the existence of an Originating and Immanent Intelligence of infinite wisdom and activity. Thus the human mind, following the clue of the miracle of Cana, thinks on and on till the actual fact that it thinks at all appears the greatest miracle of all. And recognized self-consciousness suggests an infinite self-consciousness, and the conclusion is reverently arrived at that the life of man is rooted in the life of God, and that God is a necessary deduction from the conclusions of physical science, that God is all, and all is God, and God is perfect, and God is responsible. That is the first root thought.

2. But the miracle at Cana goes further, and this is the second root thought.

Jesus, who was the chosen specimen of the race, having led the thoughts of men up 'the altar stairs of things created,' and brought them face to face with the universal immanent Mind, leads them on gently to Himself. He demonstrates His identity with the Infinite life by His command of the controlling influences of Nature, by His power of manipulating the secret processes of growth at His will, condensing into a moment of time the many months of gradual progress during which absorbed moisture in God's great laboratory normally becomes wine. 'Ye believe in God,' He said, 'believe also in me.' In that Divine utterance love and logic strive for the mastery. Ye believe in the Universal Soul, believe in the self-manifestation of the Universal Soul in Me. Believe that I represent on earth the personality, the love of the Infinite Spirit, and that 'him that cometh unto me I will in no wise cast out,' for he that comes to Me comes to God in Me. Cease to weary your thinking capacities by the attempt to realize personality in the Infinite Abstraction who fills all boundless space; come home to My heart, for My heart is the heart of God under a limitation; suffer Me to shape and guide every event in your life to the regeneration of your nature, and to interweave My life with your own.

> Come to Jesus as you are, weary and worn and sad,
> Find in Him a resting-place, and He will make you glad.

3. And the third proposition seems to be this: The miracle at Cana rebukes emphatically the superficial judgment constantly passed by a hide-bound conventionality upon the position and influence of woman. It is a significant commentary upon the action of those who would silence the persuasive tongue of woman when uplifted for

God and humanity, that the first miracle was performed by the Christ upon the suggestion of a woman, and the first and best Christian sermon ever preached was uttered by a woman's lips.

It is well to remember that, when the fiat went forth that the unthinkable Creative Spirit should bring Himself within reach of man by veiling His essential Majesty in the Incarnation, woman was chosen to be His sole tabernacle; woman was selected to be the first to gaze into the face of the wondrous Babe, to welcome Him into this world of sorrow, to guide the first tottering footsteps of the *via crucis* of His earthly life. And it is well also to remember that the pardonable eagerness of a woman availed to precipitate His first manifestation of the 'Divinity that stirred within him.' There is no rebuke in those words of calm dignity, inadequately rendered, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee?' There is only a recognition that He feels His relation to the mother of His flesh to be less controlling than His relation to the Infinite Parent-Spirit. In the Greek the words are, 'Lady, what is there between me and thee?' It is as if He had said, 'On the earth-plane we are united, and by the closest, tenderest bond, but on the heavenly plane there is no Parent but God.' Nevertheless that He may illustrate for all time what woman's influence can be, ought to be, may be, as interceder, peacemaker, prompter to high and remedial action, though He openly declares that His hour was not yet come, He hastens His manifestations that He may accede to her request.

All who believe that the Incarnation was a manifestation of a universal immanence of God should be encouraged, by the honour shown to woman at the miracle in Cana, to throw their influence into the scale in the matter of the elevation, the protection, and the rescue of woman.

For example, (1) we can do more to protect the unfallen. Let us support by every means in our power, by money, by personal service, girls' clubs, institutes, reading-rooms, everything that can counteract the influence of low places of entertainment, and public-houses.

(2) All should ceaselessly aim at accelerating the work of improving the dwellings of the poorer classes, that the evils consequent upon overcrowding may be minimized.

(3) We can protest against, remedy wherever possible, the utterly inadequate remuneration for woman's labour, which is one of the most fruitful causes of prostitution. Where a woman does a man's work she should earn a man's wage.

(4) Then they who have charge of the young can take their courage in both hands and lift the veil of mistaken prudery which fears to unfold, cautiously, purely, reverently, to young minds the God-appointed sacred functions of natural life.

(5) And as a matter of ethics, let us strive to realize ourselves, and cease not to teach, that acts are, after all, thoughts in precipitation; that 'out of the heart proceed adulteries.' Opportunity and environment are, after all, only the aids to accomplishment; where the thoughts are brought into captivity to the indwelling Divine nature, where our teaching is firmly based on the Immanence of God, however strong may be the passions of the natural man, the heart will remain pure and see God.

4. Finally, it is the sermon preached by a woman, by the Blessed Mother of the Lord, which teaches the lesson, that the key to progress in life and the fulfilment of the purpose of God for man, lie in ready obedience to the unmistakable promptings of the Divine Mind within. We call it conscience, but it is God the Spirit speaking to us; and the message from the Blessed Virgin is in these words: 'Whatsoever he saith unto you, do it.'

It is a brief but compendious sermon. It knocks on the head that favourite self-deception when we 'compound for sins we are inclined to by damning those we have no mind to.' There is more force and power in that 'whatsoever' from the lips of the human being who knew the Lord Jesus more intimately than He has ever been known after the flesh by any other, than in the most eloquent discourses of the greatest theologians. Unhesitating, instantaneous obedience to the suggestion of the Divine Immanence seeking to realize Himself within us is the road to sanctification, the panacea for heart-restlessness, the safeguard against temptation, the secret of the miracle of conversion, the conversion of water into wine, natural into spiritual, human into Divine.[1]

Third Sunday after Epiphany.

The Descent to the Plain.

'When he was come down from the mountain.'—Mt 8[1].

When Jesus teaches it is from a mountain. It is not simply as a geographical accident, but in the sense that the teaching itself lifts its head in a finer, rarer atmosphere. There is no serious challenge of this. Its practicality may be questioned, but its elevation is not challenged. It has

[1] B. Wilberforce, *Inward Vision*, 36.

spacious horizons. It braces every moral and spiritual faculty. 'He went up into a mountain, and he opened his mouth and taught.'

The instruction ended, He comes down from the mountain. Of course He does. If any teacher would keep his right to teach, that is what he will have to do. He will have to confront squarely the realities of common life, and to bring his teaching to the test of the everyday needs of everyday people.

There are other teachers who have come down from their mountain—and it has been their undoing. On the hill of their teaching we felt them mighty; when they were come down we became aware of their littleness. On the heights of the ideal we thought them great; in the plain we saw that they were mean. No greater name is there in literature than that of Goethe, and few who have taught so loftily. His confession of high sentiments and his exposition of noble principles raise our expectation. It is he of whom Carlyle said: 'The sight of such a man was to me a gospel of gospels.' But one of Goethe's most admiring apologists has this to say of his hero: 'Not only Christianity but morality itself, as it is commonly understood, was not much favoured in his life.' But it is a poor thing to botanize on the graves which idealists have dug for themselves when they were come down from their mountain. It is enough to be reminded that there have been many masters on the hill who have handled things dismally on the levels of life.

The needs of the prosaic, the test of the valley, await the teaching on the hill. Thus we watch closely when this Preacher of the Sermon on the Mount comes down. It is there or nowhere we shall find everybody's Christ. Men have shut Him within ecclesiastical systems and made Him the Christ of the institutionalists; they have set Him within the corners of a philosophy and made Him the thinker's Christ; they have shut the cell door upon Him and themselves and made Him the devotee's Christ; they have soared with Him in their minds into the heavenlies of rapt contemplation and made Him the mystic's Christ. Doubtless to none has He wholly refused Himself. But there is somewhere the people's Christ, the Christ of Every-man. He is found on the plain where common people confront common needs, anxieties, temptations; where sin and pain, disease and hunger, buying and selling are.

1. *He Himself accepted the test.*—John the Baptist had hailed Him as the Christ and had expected Him to move on lofty altitudes of majesty, power, and authority to His dominion. Being disillusioned, John sent his pathetic query which revealed his misgiving: 'Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?' The reply of Jesus, in effect, was: 'You are looking to the wrong quarter for My justification.' The vindication of God's Messiah is not in power above men, but in His pity and help among them. 'Go and tell John to cast his eyes down from the high places of this old grandiose Messianic dream to the level of the common men's needs. Go and tell John, the blind receive their sight and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, and the dead are raised up, and the poor have the gospel preached to them.' The great Forerunner had not realized that the Christ of God comes to His own in the closeness and adequacy of His saving contact with broken, needy lives.

Consider His acceptance of the test of the common level in this very story. It is a strange chapter which follows upon this laconic statement that He came down from the mountain. It would be an almost unbearable chapter if it were not so prefaced, and if He were not come down into it.

Out of the crowd, a leper; out of the city, a heart-wrung man; in a soldier's house, a dying servant; in the disciple's home, a suffering mother; 'and when even was come they brought unto him many possessed with devils.' What a world! It was the world of life which met Jesus, 'when he was come down from the mountain.'

2. *It is this test which has to be accepted by His friends and servants.* By one of them it was accepted with reluctant astonishment. It came to pass on a day that the Apostle Peter went up upon the housetop to pray, and through the gate of dreams the instructing Spirit of truth opened to him more than he had before known of the revolutionizing truth as it is in Jesus. He learned in a vision that the Christ who saves men transcends every national exclusiveness. His ideas of religious caste were broken up, and the ring-fence of race went to pieces as there came mightily upon his mind the universalism of redemption. When the vision passed he was left upon the housetop, wrestling with something new which he vaguely knew must alter everything. What will he make of it? How long will he stay there pondering it? The Spirit of truth had not finished with him. God has His way of making ideas into dynamics, and that swiftly. There is a knocking in the street, and the Spirit said to him, 'Behold, three men seek thee.' An untimely intrusion? Not so. It is the arrival from the street, and through the man

in the street, of God's interpretation of the house-top vision.

3. *The mountain is needed to make the plain endurable.* The plain is needed to interpret the mountain. Our Lord Himself will teach us this. Look closely into any record of strenuous self-giving service of His, and you will find it preceded by some sojourn on the high places of communion with God alone, or in company with His chosen friends. From that finer air He came to serve.

In the life of the spirit we need the hill to make the plain endurable. We cannot afford the activities of Christian service cut off from its resources and reserves. Movement after movement in the Christian Church has perished thus. They have died of exhaustion. The values of sustained prayer and thought, of quiet and ordered common worship, of careful instruction, of renewed inspirations, are in the power they bring to serve without disheartenment and fainting.

The plain is needed to interpret the mountain. The everyday ministry of Jesus is the real exposition of the teaching of the hill. 'Blessed are the poor in spirit.' The illuminating commentary upon that is seen when He came down from the mountain, and, though He had not where to lay His head, He kept a serene, untroubled, and victorious soul. 'Blessed are the meek.' The exposition is in the magnanimity of Jesus when He was come down from the mountain. 'Blessed are they that hunger and thirst after righteousness.' The interpretation thereof is on the plain, when He said, 'My meat is to do the will of my Father.' 'Blessed are the merciful.' The word on the hill stands in light when on the plain He whispers to a confused woman, 'Neither do I condemn thee.'

There is a saying which has been a familiar watchword in Church history: 'Doctrine the test of the stability of the Church.' That it has its needed truth to tell is witnessed by the perils and disasters into which every recurrent non-theological phase of the Church has fallen. Christianity is a revelation of truth and demands its intellectual rights. Nevertheless, in the long run, Christianity is God's way of making good people, and there is an older saying than that old maxim of the Church. He, who sent His message to the seven churches by His servant John, began each of them with this word, '*I know thy works*.' It would seem that He, who walks in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks which are the churches, makes His closest scrutiny and takes His final estimate of them when they are 'come down from the mountain.' [1]

[1] T. Yates, *The Strategies of Grace*, 202.

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY.

The Nature of Religious Truth.

'I know that my redeemer liveth.'—Job 19^{25}.

Many of those texts of orthodox doctrine and sentiment which show up so strangely in that most outspoken and fearless of all the books of the Old Testament—the Book of Job—turn out to be mistranslations. In particular, the famous verses which follow this text in the nineteenth chapter, pointing to a sure and certain hope of all-glorious resurrection in which death and all the evils worse than death with which Job is wrestling are swallowed up in victory, are changed to words which express the bare conviction that somehow and at some time things will be right. The change may be to some minds unwelcome at first sight, but it is surely right. The agony of Job or of the author of this book was not of the kind to be cured by miraculous provisions of Christian dogma. The truth that would help him, as the truth which will help any of us, had to come out of himself and his own experience—had to be a present truth.

The one thing in this passage no commentator proposes to take away or diminish is the note of certainty and assurance which has somehow come to Job out of his darkest perplexity and suffering. Suddenly his feet have touched bottom; he is on a rock; he can say, 'I know.' 'I shall see God, whom I shall see to my own good, and my eyes shall see him, and not as one estranged.' It does not matter that the reasons for his assurance are not what the Authorized Version gives us; that there are indeed no *reasons* given in this declaration of assurance; that the book ends with a confusion of mystery and inexplicability. What he has found may seem to us a poor comfort, a very reduced gospel, but he has it firm: it is his own.

No one can read the end of the Book of Job without feeling that the man who wrote it had found an answer to his problem, though the speech put into the mouth of God is not so much the answer as an evidence of the fact that an answer has been found. Somehow Job has come out of that painful questioning into a stable place, where the world of Nature with all its wonders and mysteries has become, instead of a terrible agonizing hell, something whose mystery strengthens and sustains.

How did Job get his certainty?

The earlier chapters show him exposed to two temptations, which, in our searching after life and truth, remain temptations to us all—to be selfish, to get what relief we can from our own pains and let the rest of the world be as evil as it

likes, or to cheat, to be dishonest, to say that things are all right when we know that they are not, to adopt that kind of faith which consists in believing what we know to be untrue.

1. When Job first gives vent to his misery, he is told to curse God and die, to take the relief for which he is longing and leave the world to be evil. And if we are troubled with the thought of the misery of the world, we can no doubt get some relief by deliberately becoming deaf to it. If we shut our ears long enough, we cease to hear, and get relief at the cost of the death of all but the animal part of ourselves.

Job puts that temptation from him and, as a result of his doing so, his agony ceases to concern himself alone; his complaint now is not that he is suffering, but that innocence is suffering, and suffering not only in the person of Job, but all over the world, and the impersonal agony so overmasters all thought of self in him, that it would be a relief to feel that he has somehow deserved punishment; that he is not only suffering but evil as well, if only at this cost he is enabled to think that God is not evil.

2. And with the thought comes the opposite temptation—to cheat, to be false to the facts as he sees them; to sink his own known misfortunes in the thought of the righteous universe without; to submit and say that what he knows to be wrong is right. He feels that he could bear his own misery if he could rest in the thought of the goodness of God, in the thought that all must be for the best, and that his dissenting mind is presumptuously misleading him.

This second method of escape from the perplexities which life presents is the unselfish man's temptation, as the first is the selfish man's, and it is usually supported by a much greater body of authority. Many people will tell you that troubles and perplexities such as Job's mind was suffering only come from thinking and doubting, from rash presumptions in asking questions which cannot be answered, that the simple cure of such ills is to stop thinking and doubting, to submit to the authority of our elders and betters, who are obviously our betters because they are not and have never been troubled as we are being troubled. The method of escape which is offered to Job, and which he rejects, is one which many men accept, and its acceptance brings them relief and with relief a certain power of grappling with the ordinary demands of life.

But this relief is bought at a price. Job's friends begin harmlessly enough, but before they have gone very far they are driven to defend God by accusing Job's children and Job himself of crimes for which they have not a jot of evidence. The doctrine which maintains that all human suffering is due to human guilt easily and inevitably becomes the doctrine that the unfortunate are also bad.

Job puts these two temptations from him, even though he could only hold out at the cost of feeling utterly alone in the world. 'Know now that God hath overthrown me, and hath compassed me with his net.' Out of the very midst of the negation and despair that seem the price of refusing to yield to these temptations, in his unselfishness and truthfulness, there suddenly comes an assurance that he is not alone, and he can say, 'I know that my Vindicator liveth.' He has found something in himself which draws him out of himself, which gives him an ever-widening and deepening sympathy with and understanding of his fellow-men, and which culminates in the profound moral insight and tenderness of the great speech in the thirty-first chapter.

We should note that assurance and conviction are found without an intellectual answer being found. Religious conviction and certainty come from the will, are described as issuing out of resistance to temptation. But the will from which Job's certainty is described as issuing is a disciplined will. Job gets his assurance of God because he has refused to yield to his own immediate desires, because he has made his difficulty a moral and not a personal problem, and because he has submitted his mind to the facts as he sees them, and refused to mould the facts to his mind. Such an attitude is implied to some degree in all attainment of truth.

The common testimony of all great writers in religion is that the only means of coming to religious assurance and knowledge is to learn by discipline of the will to give up merely personal desires and be humble and accepting. 'I say, moreover, if the soul will know God,' says Eckhardt, 'it must be forgetful of itself and must lose itself; for so long as it regards and takes cognizance of itself, it regards not God nor has cognizance of him. If, for God's sake, it loses itself and forsakes all things, it finds itself again in God.'

Job's assurance that comes to him at first as an immediate conviction becomes strengthened and confirmed by later experience. The final warrant for his assurance is not simply that it issues from a rational and disciplined source, a mind which has universalized its problems and been faithful to facts, but that eventually it is found to render a wider and wider stretch of experience intelligible.

What gives an abiding and real certainty in our æsthetic judgments is that as we go back and back to some works of art they go on approving themselves and seem to unfold more and more of their meaning. The same holds true of religious experience. Immediate and individual as it is, there is a long way between the first experience of assurance and the state of mind expressed in, 'I know whom I have believed.' The first immediate conviction is to be tested by its applicability to life, by its coherence with the rest of what we learn, by its rendering reality intelligible as much as are those great intuitions which are the beginnings of great scientific discoveries.

Lastly, although religious assurance as described in the Book of Job is not got by intellectual arguments, faithfulness to intellectual standards when they are relevant heightens and enhances the quality of the religious experience, and unfaithfulness lowers and perverts it. This is a truth we are apt to forget, with fatal consequences.[1]

SEPTUAGESIMA SUNDAY.

The Gates of the City.

'On the east three gates; on the north three gates; on the south three gates; and on the west three gates.'—Rev 21^{13}.

The entire description of the Holy City, in the Book of Revelation, is a parable—of course, it is more than that—but it is at least a parable of the fellowship with God declared by Jesus Christ and made possible to us in Him. It furnishes us with a picture of the fulness and completeness of that life of communion into which Christ our Lord has invited us, and which, being realized by us, is our sufficient enduement for life and service until that day when we shall see His face.

Every detail of the City's architecture and ordering, as seen by the seer in the island of Patmos, is full of significance to the people whose faces are turned thitherward. In the circumstance, for example, of its four-square dimension we have a picture of the perfectly symmetrical life in which length and breadth and height are all equal. And in the facts of its illumination, that they need no candle nor light of the sun, for the Lord giveth them light, and the Lamb is the light thereof; of its unhungering and unthirsting inhabitants, entirely satisfied with the favour and goodness of the Lord; of its river which gives constant fertility to the land through which it flows, we have alluring pictures of that fellowship into which we are invited by the gospel, and which, being realized, is adequate equipment for life and for duty until we are beyond the need of picture and parable for ever.

But the interest of the seer is aroused particularly by the Gates of the City. The City, to the seer's vision, is walled to prevent intrusion. But its walls are pierced by gates which express a friendly welcome to everybody. There are twelve gates, each bearing the name of a tribe—an encouraging fact when the moral history of some of the tribes is remembered! They are so set that each side of the City has an equal and adequate number, fronting thus the entire world.

This parable of the twelve gates, three on each of the four sides of the City, obviously means that the fellowship with God which all men need is free to all men; that the City of God is large enough to contain all God's children in all their variety; that there is no stereotyped nor uniform method of approaching Him; that as every man has turned to sin in his own way, so every man must return to God in his own way; that as there is a uniqueness about the sin of every man, so there is something gloriously unique about the salvation of every man! The twelve gates declare that God's grace is catholic, fronting with its free invitation every variety of temperament, condition, and interest.

But there is more than general considerations in the parable of the gates on the east, and north, and south, and west. For east, and north, and south, and west are not merely geographical terms. They are regions on life's moral map, places where the play of influence and circumstance is explanatory of men's attitude toward God and their action in response to the claim and challenge of His Word.

1. So, without straining the parable at all, let us suggest, first, a meaning of the three eastern gates. The east is the quarter in which the sun rises, in which the new day begins, in which the light is born. So the eastern gate may well stand for the entrance of those who seek Christ in youth. And not only in youth but because of youth; those who receive His Word with reverence and with respect; those who are thrilled, as youth is thrilled, with the idea of high adventure with which the gospel is instinct; those who have left the insurgence of that within them which perplexes and affrights them, and are impelled rather than compelled to Jesus Christ; those who bring unwearied energies to the service of the Name they have learned to

[1] A. D. Lindsay, *The Nature of Religious Truth*, 189.

love. The paths round about the eastern gate are smooth and flower-decked. There are no wrecked ideals, nor outraged vows, nor lashing remorse amongst those who come by the eastern gate; although there is often an urgent and sensitive conscience moving young men and women in the first flush of their self-conscious young manhood and womanhood to Jesus Christ.

> Just as I am, young, strong, and free,
> To be the best that I can be
> For truth and righteousness and Thee,
> Jesus, my Lord, I come.

2. Then there are the northern gates. The north is the quarter from which the winter gales blow over the Arctic seas. And they may well stand for the entrance of those who have been searched by experiences of adversity and sorrow and disappointment; whose hearts have been broken, whose lives have been crushed as between the upper and nether millstones, and are now empty and cheerless and chill; who know what it is to have bitter hours of conviction and shame and remorse about their own sin; through whose lives the chill blast of condemnation blows constantly. Thank God, there are three gates on the north for those who are actually driven to Jesus Christ, before the blast, for shelter. Mary Magdalene came in by the north gate; and the publican also who stood and smote upon his breast as the chill of the north blast swept his being, and said, 'God, be merciful to me, a sinner.'

The north gate, too, may also stand for the entrance of those whose temperament exposes them to the chilling, cold blasts of doubt and unbelief. Some people—and particularly some of the young people of the present day—can no more help asking questions than needing their food. Some of them are particularly exposed by their temperament to the devastating blasts of unbelief and doubt; to whom problems and philosophies are constantly offering challenge; upon whom the question, 'Is it rational? Is it reasonable?' forces itself; to whom the only gospel seems to be, 'Come, let us reason together.' Thomas came in by that gate, which stands open to assure us that all our mental strength—the product of our mental struggle, that all our powers of reason and enlightenment are invited by Jesus Christ into the City for His service.

3. Then there are the southern gates. The south is the quarter from which warm, genial brightness comes. The south gates, therefore, may well stand for the entrance of those who are drawn to Jesus Christ by the very ardours and passions of their emotional nature, so easily aroused, so readily inflammable; by the generous impulses which are for ever seeking expression in something or in some one on whom to lavish affection and tenderness; by their inner intimations of immortality which will not be silenced; by the ideals of life discerned in the clear light of the sun which awaken desire and inform purpose; by life's joyful experiences—of its beauty, its friendship, its love, its glad fullness. I think the southern gate stands for the entrance of those to whom such things are the most potent of all influences in life. And they may stand also for the entrance of those in whom the reaction of such a temperament to the ordinary changes of life produces a sense of incompleteness and need. For all such warm, quick, quivering, emotional natures are as capable of deep dejections as of uplifting exaltations. Paul went in by the southern gate. Thenceforward he found his restless quest for ever satisfied, and his emotions for ever fixed, by cheerful engagement in the City's service and in the fellowship of the City's Lord.

4. Last of all, there are the western gates. The west is the quarter in which the sun sets, in which the light dies. We look out at the setting sun and get a suggestion in its copper brilliance of that which lies beyond, and something more than a hint of the transiency of life. So the western gates may well stand for the entrance of those who are world-weary. It does not require a man to be very old to be world-weary, nor a woman to have gone through an up-and-down experience of any length to become utterly world-weary, utterly bored, utterly sick of things that do not profit and that can only be too dearly purchased. And their very weariness is just Christ's invitation to fellowship with Him in which is rest and energy and soul-satisfaction. And these western gates may stand, too, for the entrance of those whose life-work is nearly done, to whom earth's joys grow dim.

Those who come in by the western gates—perhaps they are visionary, but they comprise old and young alike. Nathanael came in, and John also, one old and the other young, at the western gates. And they came in—the old man with his dreams of the past, and the young man with his visions of the future, to find their thoughts utterly surpassed in the glory of fellowship with Jesus Christ.

John Bunyan scents the meaning of the parable of the gates when he says: 'Now, just as the gates were opened to let in the men, I looked in after them; and behold, the City shone like the sun;

the streets also were paved with gold, and in them walked many men, with crowns on their heads, palms in their hands, and golden harps to sing praises withal. There were also of them that had wings, and they answered one another without intermission, saying, " Holy holy, holy, is the Lord." And after that they shut up the gates ; which, when I had seen, I wished myself amongst them. . . . I wished myself amongst them.' [1]

[1] J. S. Holden, *The God-Lit Road*, 311.

Surprises in the Early Church in Rome.

By the Reverend Albert G. Mackinnon, D.D., Rome.

The title which first suggested itself was, ' The Most Interesting Church in History ' ; but it would have challenged criticism, perhaps aroused resentment. Many of my readers, no doubt, belong to famous congregations, which are doing great things in the world to-day, and which have a membership that would make the Church of St. Paul's time in Rome appear numerically insignificant, therefore I must discard the adjective ' most generous ' or ' most influential ' ; but there is one word I shall not yield, and that is ' most surprising.' When I read with gratification the annual reports of our great city churches, and scan their long membership rolls and subscription lists, I say to myself : ' Well, that is just what I expected. They have done splendidly, but they had it in them. With such a pastor and people they could not do otherwise.'

When, however, I study the first Christian Church in Rome I get a series of shocks. Everything is so unexpected. This Church does not conform to the rules. It surprises you by its lack of conventionality at every turn. It is so different from the pattern of to-day that I am almost tempted to dub St. Paul a Nonconformist ! Let us note some of those surprising features which may perhaps make us a little uncomfortable and lessen our pride in things which were our boast.

1. Its founder is unknown. We are accustomed to a big tablet in the vestibule commemorating the name of some great preacher, who had started the cause which had grown into a flourishing congregation, or perhaps that of some generous donor, whose money had laid the foundation-stone. I do not condemn such a custom. There is an inspiration in great names, and they are ' On Fame's eternal bead-roll worthy to be filed.' But this Church in Rome could put up no such tablet ; for the person who originated it has not even handed down his name. It was not St. Paul. He certainly does not claim that honour. With regard to Corinth it was different. He asserted a parental claim over that Church ; but with Rome, no. It was not St. Peter, for when he appeared in the city there was already a strong Church established. Who, then, were its originators ?

We must search for them amongst the Jewish colony. From the days of Pompey, the Great, this foreign community had steadily increased in size. Julius Cæsar fostered it. On the very day in which he was murdered a great act of Jewish emancipation was passed by the Senate granting them a free administration of their own funds, and a complete jurisdiction over their own members. No wonder that for three days the Jews turned the Forum into a weeping-place and bewailed the Great Cæsar who had proved himself their friend. We read that in 4 B.C., eight thousand Roman Jews met a deputation from Palestine to Augustus. This may be an exaggeration ; still, if we put their population at sixty thousand, it was not impossible ; and Sejanus, who was their enemy in the time of Tiberius, enrolled four thousand in a foreign legion and sent them to Sardinia to put down the brigands. It was from this colony in the Capital that in A.D. 29, we read, there came to the Feast of Pentecost, ' Sojourners from Rome, both Jews and proselytes.' That is as near as we can get to the founders of the Church. From that group of travellers some came back Christians.

' Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which have come to pass there in these days ? ' said the two disciples to Jesus on the road to Emmaus. Behind these words lies a suggestive fact. Jerusalem was full of talk about Calvary, and into that babble of tongues came those Jews from Rome. Their curiosity must have been aroused, their interest excited, and in one or two hearts the truth accepted. The meaning of the Cross was seen in its true light,

and when they got back to Rome they told their friends, and so the Church in Rome began and grew, and fulfilled the prediction in the Parable of the Leaven.

2. Its second surprising feature is that its first success was achieved through a disturbance. Church quarrels are the saddest, but even they are often overruled for good. That may seem a poor consolation when a congregation splits; but history, in addition to the famous case of Barnabas and Paul, has many instances when the devil was caught in his own net.

One day in A.D. 52 the Emperor Claudius was looking out of his window on the Palatine. Beneath lay the magnificent arena of the Circus Maximus, but it was not that which attracted his attention. On the other side rose the slopes of the Aventine, and where now stands the church of St. Prisca stood a humble Roman house. It was the home of a Jewish tent-maker called Aquila; but one reading between the lines in the New Testament might fairly conjecture that it was run by his wife Priscilla, as her name is often put first, and the cemetery in Rome to-day where they are buried is called after the wife. She seems to have been the dominating spirit. Whether she had anything, however, to do with the row must be guesswork. It became alarming enough to rivet the Emperor's gaze. A tumult in the streets of Rome had always to be watched. One never knew what it might turn to. The shouts of angry voices carried across the little valley. The crowd increased, blows were following words. The whole of the Aventine seemed in an uproar. Suetonius in his history tells us the cause. He says it was a tumult about one 'Chrestos.' The Jews were arguing in their usual way. Their bark may have been worse than their bite, but how was Claudius to know? The thing must be stopped at once. He dealt with it as one might with a dog-fight in one's house, by kicking both combatants out. He was going to have no more disturbances of that kind, so he passed an edict that all Jews were to be expelled from Rome at once. Of course that included the little Christian community as well, for the authorities looked upon them as a Jewish sect.

At the time this may have seemed a great disaster; but scattering fire often only increases it. Aquila and Priscilla went as far as Corinth, and there they met Paul, and that was a turning-point in the fortunes of the Roman Church. I am convinced that his new friends fanned his desire to visit Rome. In the long nights in Corinth they talked about it. They would take no refusal. Paul must come to the Eternal City. I think Priscilla was a lady who got her way. She has left her mark on Scripture, and even Paul's will would be bent by hers. She was determined that the Apostle should visit her city. She made him promise, and he kept his word, though it meant five years as a prisoner. That, at least, is my reading of the story.

But that controversy on the Aventine had a more far-reaching result than the cruel temporary expulsion of the Jews from Rome. When Paul eventually came to Rome, he invited the leaders of the Jews, who had now returned, to meet him. They came; but, however hostile most of them felt, they curbed their passions. They could not risk another tumult and another summary expulsion: the memory of Claudius was still too vivid, so they behaved themselves, and Paul had peace. But if it had not been for the former disturbance with its disastrous sequel, they would have imperilled the work and the very life of the Apostle; but the salutary lesson of Claudius had taught them restraint. So the religious dispute of A.D. 52 bore fruit in A.D. 60. Had it not been for that previous tumult about one 'Chrestos,' Paul might never have got a chance in Rome. I do not wish to put a premium on Church disputes, but their sequel is often a surprise.

3. Another matter for astonishment is the lack of central organization. After twenty-eight years of existence, no deacons or presbyters! This takes our breath away to-day. We cannot think of a Church without its framework of intricate organization. From the pastor down to the sub-secretary of the most juvenile society, there is a mass of human machinery which demands an expert to understand. The Roman Church does not seem to have had even a pastor or ruling elder or leading member. Otherwise Paul would not have addressed it as he did. When he writes it a letter, he does not label it as we would expect: 'To the Church of God that is in Rome.' He singles out no bishop or minister. He directs his letter to no central organization, but: 'To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints.'

As we read the Epistle, we detect traces of five different congregations in the city. Two of these, as I shall mention presently, may perhaps be considered as one. This would leave four separate centres where the Christians forgathered.

The most prominent was doubtless the home of Aquila and Priscilla on the Aventine. Its site

has been definitely fixed. 'Greet the church that is in their house,' writes the Apostle. Those simple words picture the scene. During the week the atrium of that house would present a busy scene. Aquila was evidently a prosperous tent-maker and able to employ workmen. Their benches and tables would fill the little court; but on Saturday night, Priscilla would take command. There would be what is called in Scotland 'a reddin' up.' The tables would be removed, the place thoroughly scrubbed out, and benches arranged for the coming Lord's Day. Then in twos and threes little groups could be seen climbing the Aventine and wending their way to that hospitable door. How packed it would be later when Paul himself was the preacher! In fact, we are told how he discoursed from morning till night with the Jews, and one may be pretty certain that this was the spot of that historic meeting. In so far as the five distinct congregations had any common centre, I should be inclined to look upon this house as that place. Yet it did not dominate the others to such an extent that Paul should address his letter to it as representing all. The organization at that time was purely congregational.

'Salute them which are of Aristobulus's household'; 'Greet them that be of the household of Narcissus': these messages may refer to the saints in Cæsar's household. As these names have been found on the lists of the Imperial staff, it is just possible they are one and the same, and that their circle constituted the little Church in the Imperial palace. A few weeks ago Professor Bartoli discovered the remains of an early Christian sanctuary under the Villa Mills on the Palatine in the precincts of the palace of Augustus, which he is at present exploring. During the Middle Ages it had been used as a wine-cellar; but he is certain it was a meeting-place for Christians in Cæsar's palace.

'Salute Asyncritus, Phlegon, Hermas, Patrobas, Hermes, and the brethren which are with them.' These words take us out to the recently discovered 'House of Hermes' on the Appian Way. Without doubt this was one of the earliest meeting-places of the Christians. Lying in a hollow, it had the advantage of not being too conspicuous, and, being outside the walls, was more private. It formed a convenient centre for a considerable Christian community in that neighbourhood.

'Salute Philologus, and Julia, Nereus, and his sister, and Olympas, and all the saints which are with them.' In what part of Rome this house was, we cannot say. It was obviously not in the Jewish quarter.

From all this it is clear that Rome, which in later ages was to become a centre of autocracy for the Church, at this time lacked those elements of concentration which were eventually to raise her to the perilous heights of spiritual power and pride. Such organization as she possessed was simpler in form than that of the Churches of Asia.

4. Another surprise awaits us when we examine carefully the roll of that first Church and note the nationality of its members. Born and bred, as they were, amongst the Jews, we should expect their names to predominate. Yet, if the list given is a true sample of the rest, we are amazed to find how few there are of Hebrew origin. All this casts light on the bitterness of that tumult which Claudius witnessed. The Jews did not make an open attack again on the Christians; but they drew apart. Prejudice hardened their hearts. They would have nothing to do with 'Chrestos.' Only five mentioned are clearly Hebrews. Of these three are said to be the kinsmen of Paul: Andronicus, Junias, and Herodion, leaving Aquila and Mary only as the independent representatives of their race, though one might perhaps include Apelles. Priscilla was more than likely a Roman, as her name indicates, and her character too; for there was evidently a good deal of the Roman matron about her!

What about the sixty thousand Jews? Was ever a communion-roll more condemnatory of a race than that which we find in this early Roman Church? What a meaning and emphasis this disclosure gives to Paul's quotation of righteous indignation and disappointment: 'Go unto this people, and say, Hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand; and seeing ye shall see, and not perceive. . . . Be it known therefore unto you, that the salvation of God is sent unto the Gentiles, and that they will hear it.'

5. A last surprise which I shall mention, is the prominent place women held in that Roman Church. We are apt to think that it is only now that the 'Fair Sex' is coming into its own. Paul showed the way at the very beginning. He honoured woman by trusting her. No man has been so maligned and misunderstood on this score. When he is to send his precious manuscript to Rome, to whom does he commit it? A woman, Phoebe. He commends her as 'our sister,' elevating woman to the dignity of equal brotherhood in Christ. It is Paul who says: 'There is neither male nor female, for we are all one in Christ Jesus.'

One-third of the names recorded on that historic

roll are those of women. Imagination might well fill in some scenes of those days. When news reaches Rome that Paul's ship had arrived at Puteoli, we can imagine what a gathering there would be of the Christians to consider how best to welcome him. If I have read the character of Priscilla aright, I feel sure she must have been one of the first on her feet, her warm heart overflowing with enthusiasm, rousing the younger men to volunteer to go all the way to Appii Forum, and the older ones to The Three Taverns. All aglow with joyous excitement, she would speak up in that meeting, and suggest means for making the hard lot of the prisoner a little more comfortable. Trust her for that. When Paul came a second time to Rome as a prisoner in A.D. 68, we hear of no escort going forth to welcome him. But then Priscilla was not in Rome!

Contributions and Comments.

'The Chaldaeans.'

In the October number of The Expository Times, Mr. Geo. B. Michell passes some criticisms on my article, which appeared in the June issue. These criticisms are less damaging, however, than he appears to think.

Mr. Michell complains that I did not give proof that any of the classes of wise men referred to in Daniel were priests. He would seem not to have noticed that I was replying to the positions of Boutflower; and since it was common ground between us that these wise men were priests, it did not seem necessary to argue the point, especially since Jastrow's authority could be invoked in its support.

Mr. Michell states pontifically that 'the simple fact is that the "Chaldæans" of Daniel were the men who could read and write the ancient Sumerian literature of Chaldæa.' I am grateful for the finality of this judgment. Mr. Michell is clearly the right person to complain of the absence of proofs, since he so singularly dispenses with his own.

He further tells us that the Semitic Akkadian became extinct quite early in history, and was replaced by Aramaic, while he does not believe that Sumerian ever became an extinct language. Earlier, he recognizes that the language of the inscriptions, and the language of law and of official dispatches to other parts of the Empire, was this long-extinct Semitic Akkadian, while, for the existence of the still current Sumerian, which he postulates, he brings forward nothing but his own bare assertion. Perhaps we may be allowed to wait until he has convinced the Assyriologists before we accept this opinion.

He asks what proof there is that the language of the Chaldæans or of their government was Semitic. The admitted fact that their inscriptions, their legal documents and official dispatches are in a Semitic language would lead quite naturally to this conclusion, in the absence of any evidence of another language of government having been current at the time. Mr. Michell states that the Aramaic dockets prove that the current tongue was not the Semitic Akkadian, and he later says that Aramaic had replaced the Semitic Akkadian. What place, then, would Mr. Michell himself leave for the Sumerian which he believes still to have been current, and to have been the language of the government? If, *ex hypothesi*, Aramaic was the common speech, and all legal documents and official dispatches were in the Semitic Akkadian, what functions of government does he suppose to have been carried on in the Sumerian tongue which he assumes still to have been current? Perhaps Nebuchadrezzar reserved it for his tea-parties.

Mr. Michell's strictures under (3) puzzle me to the point of mirth. Mr. Michell agrees with me that the Book of Daniel represents Daniel as having been a 'Chaldæan,' whatever that term may have denoted. Mr. Michell thinks that a 'Chaldæan' was one who could read and write Sumerian, but since he himself maintains that this is precisely what Daniel was taught to do, it follows that he holds that Daniel was a 'Chaldæan.' Mr. Boutflower holds that the 'Chaldæans' were the priests of Bel, and consisted exclusively of men of the Chaldæan race. But the Book of Daniel represents Daniel, a Hebrew, as having been a 'Chaldæan.' Clearly, then, Boutflower and the Book of Daniel are in disagreement. Mr. Michell is so worried by the word 'order' that he misses the point. In the statement he criticises, I was meeting Bout-

flower on his own ground, and exposing the implications of his positions. I still fail to see Mr. Michell's complaint against my logic. If, *ex hypothesi*, the 'Chaldæans' were the priests of Bel, and if Daniel was a 'Chaldæan,' then Daniel was a priest of Bel. If, *ex hypothesi*, the priests of Bel were exclusively of Chaldæan race, and if Daniel was not of Chaldæan race, but of Hebrew race, then Daniel could not have been a priest of Bel. I tried to point out this essential contradiction, and my argument would seem to be elementary logic. Mr. Michell can only overthrow the logical sequence of my argument if he overthrows the second premiss in each of these cases. His disagreement with the first premiss is as irrelevant as my own. And since he stoutly maintains that Daniel was a 'Chaldæan,' and doubtless agrees that Daniel was a Hebrew, I am puzzled to know just what his complaint is.

At the close of his communication, Mr. Michell refers to 'Dr. Dick Wilson's analogy of a "Grecian."' I fear he has once again leapt to a too hasty and unwarranted conclusion. Had he been more careful, he would have noticed that the analogy I criticised appeared in a work issued in the name of J. D. Wilson, who would seem to be a different person from R. D. Wilson, the Princeton Professor.

H. H. Rowley.

Oxford.

'A Good Man.'

In the article 'Who was the Rich Young Ruler?' published in your November issue, there is an error which I think should be pointed out. The assertion that Barnabas 'is the only person that the New Testament calls "good"—outside Jesus' is inaccurate. Joseph of Arimathæa is described in Lk 23^{50} as 'a good man.' He also was a secret disciple; he was wealthy and a member of the Sanhedrin.

J. E. Compton.

Colchester.

Entre Nous.

Christ's Laws and Psychic Healing.

An analysis of the principles underlying psycho-analysis has been published by Dr. A. E. Davis. It is a condensed account of three lectures which he delivered last year in the Lady Chapel of Liverpool Cathedral—*The Principles of Psycho-Therapy* (Thompson, Liverpool; 6d.). Much has been written on Psycho-Therapy, but this is the clearest and the sanest account in small compass that we have seen. The widespread demand for psychological knowledge denotes, Dr. Davis believes, a world-wide protest against the pursuit of knowledge being exclusively in the direction of the physical. 'I attributed it to Divine Purpose; the first steps in the fulfilment of a promise made 1900 years ago. I regarded psycho-analysis as a cosmic counter movement.' Psychic healing, he says, is based on three laws, all of which are found in Christ's teaching. The first is the power of faith to heal—a faith which must be present in both healer and healed. The second is the law of human sympathy—not that that sympathy was non-existent before Christ's time, but that He was undoubtedly the first to direct attention to its enormous powers and to teach it. 'Confide ye in one another,' 'Bear ye one another's burdens.' The third law is the law of love, which is unselfishness. The commands, 'Love ye one another' and 'Love thy neighbour as thyself,' if followed, would have far-reaching effects for the individual and for the whole of mankind. 'In the individual, the finer instincts would be developed and the baser instincts crushed.

'Among the latter would be jealousy, anger, envy, temptation, cruelty, selfishness, and unrestrained desires. All these are opposed to our finer instincts, with their instrument of expression, the conscience. Such opposition leads to mental conflict.

'The absence of such conflict is harmony; harmony of mind, body and spirit, constituting health. In the cases of psychic illnesses which have originated, or are kept up, by excessive self-regard, the aim of the physician must be to direct the flow of energy into nobler and healthier channels.' Faith then works 'in a scientifically demonstrable manner through the sympathetic nervous system, the regulator of all organic processes in the body; sympathy hastens all forms of psychic healing, and is a *sine qua non* in discovering and removing mental tension; love, through its quality of unselfishness, tends to maintain mental and physical health.'

Emotion in Religion.

'A well-known minister was conducting an evangelistic mission in a great American city. While presenting the charms of the gospel in the light of reason, he did not hesitate to encourage the appropriate degree of emotion.

'His host was a well-known and wealthy business man who frequently appeared on "'change" in the course of his business. One evening they sat over the fire discussing the mission, when the business man ventured to express his opinion that evangelism was far too emotional for him. "I don't believe in all this excitement," he said. "It raises the temperature and interferes with clear judgment. You're apt to regret afterward the steps you have taken at the impulse of the strong feeling of the moment." The minister said, by way of reply, simply, "That is a very interesting point of view." Then, apparently changing the subject, he said abruptly, "What are you doing to-morrow morning?" "Oh," replied his host, "I'm going down to the Street; I must be on 'Change to-morrow." "May I come with you?" said the minister. "Certainly," his friend replied, "you can watch from the gallery." The next morning the minister found himself looking down upon the arena of battle at the exchange. Men seemed to have gone mad. The air thrilled with excitement. Hatless and hoarse with calling and bawling, his business friend was as excited as the rest. After it was over he came rushing up to the minister. "What did you think of it?" he asked breathlessly. The minister replied coldly, but with a twinkle in his eye: "Too much excitement for me. I don't believe in all this emotion. I like things quieter myself. Don't see what the fuss is all about."

'The business man looked at him and then nodded his head slowly. "Yes," he said, "I see your point. I know what you mean. It's worth thinking over."'

The Rev. A. D. Belden, B.D., has gathered a number of stories from real life into his small volume, *When Power Comes* (Sampson Low; 3s. 6d. net), and it is from it that 'Emotion in Religion' is quoted. It is more concise than most of the stories, and for this reason it is perhaps hardly characteristic. But it is a good story, and this is a good collection.

A New Year Message.

It is not necessary to do more than announce a new book by Dr. Morrison. Its title is *The Gateways of the Stars* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net), and it contains sixty-nine short addresses.

The last address is a word for the New Year, 'So will not we go back from Thee' (Ps 80[28]). 'To go back from God is to desert Him. It is to turn away the footsteps of our heart from Him. It is to doubt the vision we have had of Him in our intenser and more illumined moments. And quietly to determine in the opening year that whatever comes we shall not go back from God is one of the open secrets of the saints.'

'We are tempted sometimes to go back from God by the apparent indifference of heaven. There are seasons of the soul when things unseen are touched with a strange sense of unreality. The lamp that burns upon my study table is as nothing to the radiance of the moon. But then the lamp is near me, and I read by it, till I grow quite oblivious of the moon. And so there are seasons when the things around us so grip us in their vividness, that things eternal tend to grow unreal. At such times we do not renounce God, but we are often tempted to go back from Him. We lose the largeness of His presence.

'Again, we are tempted to retrogression in hours when all the lights are burning low. None is so strong that he does not now and then have fainting-fits. We lose heart, perhaps we know not how. A dull depression seizes on our spirits. Everything loses its keenness and its colour, and the whole world seems to be wrapt in grey. Now such seasons are always fraught with peril to the soul. They tempt us to unlawful extrications, perhaps in the immediate solace of the senses. But, even so, the brave heart will summon up its powers, and say, we will not go back from Thee.

'And then we are all tempted to go back from God, as the disciples were tempted to go back from Christ. To be perfect as is our Heavenly Father is a standard that often seems impossible. Is it any use striving to be holy with these insurgent and rebellious hearts? So are we tempted to take the lower road, thinking it more level to our powers, and we settle down into the second best. That is the tragedy of many lives—they have settled down into the second best. They had gleams once of the summit of Mount Everest; now they are content to dwell below it. But the real victory of this life of ours is *not* to gain the summit we have seen; it is to keep on climbing to the end. God's best in Christ is not for elect souls. It is for every one who trusts Him. Things that are impossible with man are possible with God. *So*, spite of all our failures, *we shall not go back from*

Thee in the New Year which is opening at our feet.'

'They that handle the pen' (Jg 5[14]).

The lessons that a pencil or a pen may teach have often been the subject of a sermon for boys and girls. But there is fresh thought in the one from which we quote. It is by the Rev. John MacBeath, M.A., of Fillebrook Baptist Church, Leytonstone, and is found in *Roadmakers and Roadmenders*. We believe that this is Mr. MacBeath's first book of young people's material, but it should not be his last. The sermons are capital—thirty-four of them—and the price is only 2s. 6d. (Carey Press).

A little boy had an imaginary conversation with his pencil, and in it the pencil said some wise things which the boy never forgot. Ever afterwards he thought of the things that he and his pencil had in common. 'The business of a pencil is to make marks, and it should be the business of every boy and girl to make a mark. I don't mean so much the marks we make in our examinations, or the score we make in cricket or tennis, and I certainly don't mean the marks of worry or care that some boys and girls make on mother's brow: nor have I in mind the marks a boy makes with his pocket-knife on trees or benches in the park and other places. I mean what everybody means when they say that a man has made his mark. They mean that he made a success of some good cause.

'That boy discovered this too: it is not the wood of the pencil that makes the mark, but the lead inside, and it is not the "wooden" things about a boy that will enable him to make his mark; it is the heart he carries inside, it is the mind within, it is the hidden will and purpose, the secret determination that will bear him through difficulty and discouragement to his goal.

'David Livingstone was not a big man, but he had a mighty spirit within, and a conquering will. He made his mark. He left his mark upon the history and geography of Africa and influenced the thought and action of civilized peoples.

'Another thing the pencil said to the schoolboy was this: "When I came into the world I could not make a mark, but I've been sharpened since; have you?" He couldn't say anything, but he began to think that after all there may be some good in schools and teachers and lessons and books, because they sharpen a boy's mind, they give point to a girl's intelligence, they prepare us to make our mark, so that we may go out into the world and be good for something. Nobody likes blunt or dull people: blunt people sometimes like themselves, but no one else does; and nobody likes people who are too sharp: a pencil that is too sharp will break, and a boy who is too sharp will get into trouble. But it is fine to be quick—that is, if you are quick in the right place—not quick-tempered, but quick at arithmetic, quick to oblige, quick to obey, quick at errands.

'There was a boy who once came away from a gentleman's office and said to another boy he met that the gentleman didn't seem to be able to see. And when he was asked why he had that idea, he said: "Why, I wasn't in his office a minute before he asked me twice where my cap was, and it was on my head all the time!"

'I like a pencil with a sharp point, and I like a boy with a keen, alert mind. He will make his mark.

'We are not always careful about a new pencil: there is so much of it that it seems as if it would never end. But afterwards, when it gets shorter, we take more care of it, and that is how we feel about time. We are too careless about it when we are young because we seem to have so much, but later on we begin to feel its real value because it is always getting less and less. To waste time is as bad as to waste money; it is worse, because you might get your money back again, but you can't get time over again.

'Is that all the pencil said to the schoolboy? You would never think that there was so much in a pencil. But before he slept that night the boy heard the pencil whisper this last word: "And I bear my maker's name; do you?" Well, after that he couldn't sleep for a while. He remembered the story of the old French general who said that if his heart were taken from his body after his death, and cut into small pieces, the name of Napoleon would be found written on every piece. He loved his emperor as much as that.

'I believe we all should bear our Maker's name, not only where the general wore his emperor's name, but where the pencil wears its maker's name—on the outside, on our actions and words and behaviour.'

'The Liverpool Review.'

In the December number of *The Liverpool Review* Canon Raven has a suggestive treatment of Ezk 12[22]: 'The days are at hand, and every vision is coming to its fulfilment.' How does a

new vision of God come? he asks, and finds that two conditions are necessary. When both are fulfilled there is a great step forward. 'You can test it if you think of the great religious movements associated with the names of Moses, of Samuel, of Ezra and Nehemiah, or of St. Paul, St. Francis, or Martin Luther. The two conditions are these. There is first a development in civilization, a general enlargement of human life, a change in the order and level of society. Then, secondly, alongside of these secular events must be their religious interpretation. Those whose special task is the care of religion must be sensitive to the new ideas and discoveries of the time, and have the courage to see and declare the fresh vision of God which they make possible. Sometimes this re-birth of religion is the work of one or more prophets or geniuses; sometimes, as in the time of Ezra or of Luther, a general movement in the Church ushers in a new age.'

These two conditions are fulfilled to-day. 'We have had a century in which man's outlook and way of life have been drastically and enormously changed.

'The second may seem less obvious. The Church or the churches have been slow to appreciate the discoveries of the new age, slow to shake themselves free from ideas and habits of thought and practice that belong to the past. . . . But the time of uncertainty and obscurantism is passing away.'

This Christmas number of *The Liverpool Review* is a larger publication than usual. It contains sixteen pages of reading matter. It is always profusely illustrated—artistic illustrations be it noted—and this month there are four extra pages. The Review is a model of its kind, having an amazing amount of variety in it. It should be of interest beyond the boundaries of the diocese. A series of value is Dr. Budden's articles on Parish Churches.

John S. Hoyland.

Joseph de Maistre, writing to his young son soon after he left home, said: 'This morning I felt a tightening at my heart when a pet dog came running in and jumped upon your bed, where he finds you no more. He soon perceived his mistake, and said clearly enough, after his own fashion: "I am mistaken; where can he be then?" As for me, I have felt all that you will feel, if ever you pursue this mighty trade of being a father.' Mr. John Hoyland, already well known to us for his book of Prayers, written for use in an Indian College, and for 'The Sacrament of Common Life,' is pursuing this mighty trade, and in *Prayers for a One-Year-Old* (Heffer; 2s. 6d. net) we have the thoughts on life and on God that the little one-year-old son suggests to him.

Teach us again to-day,
Our Son,
This thy incredible truth—
That God rejoiceth in human love,
Yearneth for human love, human trust,
Acheth to save and redeem human hearts, human lives,
From each shadow of pain, each slightest suggestion of evil,
Striveth for man's well-being, shaping and building him right,
Fighteth, with all His eternal wisdom and skill,
The forces that pull man back to the beast,—
Even as we, weak visionless creatures, thy parents,
Rejoice, yearn, ache, strive, fight for thee and thy welfare,—
Yea, and how vastly, ineffably more.

Teach us this lesson anew,
Small prophet of truth.

Gerald Gould.

THE ATONEMENT.

One died upon a lonely Cross
—Lonely enough with two beside.
Dear, that was your loss and my loss,
And it was there we died.
O past the scope of hand's compelling,
Past the cunning of the eyes,
Past the noose that thought, rebelling,
Flings to snare the skies,
His love reached out to every part,
And taught his fellows to atone,
And broke my heart and broke your heart,
And would not let him die alone.[1]

[1] *Beauty the Pilgrim*, 9.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Is there to be a serious reaction from Modernism? Or are we arriving at that middle position which so often occurs between two extremes? If one reads the history of human thought one finds a constant swing of the pendulum. One age seizes a half-truth, the succeeding age seizes the other half, and then there is a reconciliation in a third age. And the process goes on *ad infinitum*. We passed out of the age of orthodoxy a generation or more ago, and for the past thirty or forty years we have been living under the guidance of 'modern thought.' Are we due for a great reconciliation? In any case, it is worth while setting down in plain terms the case which traditional opinions makes against Modernism. It is neither so feeble nor so negligible as many take for granted.

To take the most important and most deadly criticism first, it is said that Liberalism in theology is singularly barren. It is no 'gospel.' It is suitable only for the minority of intellectuals. What has it to say to the prodigal, the down-and-out, the submerged tenth, the people to whom the Salvation Army appeals and whom the Army succeeds in saving? All the great revivals, it is said, have happened on the basis of 'the old gospel.' All the conversions we hear about to-day are in circles where the old gospel is preached. What kind of message has Modernism to present to those without much intellect (the great majority), and to those whose mind and soul are overlaid with the flesh and the devil?

The Modernist cannot very easily turn the point of all this, even if he is sceptical of the worth of many 'conversions.' One of the most brilliant of America's advanced and critical scholars confessed lately that this criticism has, as a matter of fact, been justified by the barrenness of liberal theology. He does not admit that the modern critical believer has no message for the 'lost,' but he says that as a matter of actual fact the liberal theologian has given the impression that he has no positive message by his emphasis on the negative side of his attitude. And he pleads for a more direct and simple affirmation by Modernism of its positive beliefs.

We may admit, then, that Modernism will need more and more to put forward its positive message for mankind. In an article in the new *Modern Churchman*, the Rev. Herbert Edmonds, Rector of St. John's, Manchester, endeavours to do this. He is aware of the reproach levelled against Modernism, and he states its positive message in plain terms. This includes the Fatherhood of God, the clear recognition of sin and of the necessity of the grace of God, the fact of Christ as the Mediator and Interpreter of both God and man, and the certainty of immortality.

It is just in regard to the most important of them all, the nature and mission of Christ, that the second criticism is levelled against the Modernist teacher. The Fundamentalist asks (and he is not alone in this), 'Was Jesus Christ the Eternal Son

of God? Did His death effect anything at all *erga Deum*? Is the Holy Spirit a Person? And is Christianity a miraculous, supernatural event?' These are the matters about which the ordinary Christian cares. He wants to know whether the ministry of Jesus was the ministry of God in the flesh, and whether he can thus believe that God has actually broken in on our world-system in a miraculous way. If the answer is negative or vague or hedged about with explanations to the effect that Modernism does not say miracles cannot happen, it only says they have not happened, he feels that the main barrier between faith and negation has disappeared.

In all these matters Modernism has its answer. And perhaps as good an answer as could be wished will be found in Bishop BARNES's new book, reviewed in another column. We are not taking the side of the Fundamentalist in this note. But the other side is so often stated, and the plain man who clings to tradition is so inarticulate that it is of some moment to put into words what he says to himself and what he feels about things. And the moral is plain. It is of the utmost urgency that the relation of the Christian Church to the great facts of faith should be defined, and the real effect of modern discovery and modern critical thought on Christian belief should be stated, so that the plain man may know where he is and on what he is standing. In other words, the Church must *teach*, and must *affirm*, what it believes to be true. Only thus will it secure confidence and power for its great mission among men.

It is good to remind ourselves from time to time of our no less than infinite debt to the past. It is a truism more widely acknowledged than acted upon that the present cannot even be understood without some acquaintance with the past. We are where and what we are because of the thoughts that were cherished, and the work that was done, and the institutions that were slowly wrought out in ages long gone by, and by our unremembered or too little remembered ancestors.

As a contribution to the recognition of our indefeasible debt to the past, the Clarendon Press of Oxford, which has long been famous for the ripe scholarship and the practical value of the books which it has issued, recently published two volumes of unusual interest on 'The Legacy of Greece' and 'The Legacy of Rome' respectively, and they have wisely followed this up by an equally valuable volume on *The Legacy of Israel* (10s. net). This continues in a sense the volume published two or three years ago, and noticed at length in these columns, on 'The People and the Book,' which dealt more specifically with the history and religion of the Old Testament period and with the problems raised by that great literature, whereas this volume deals with the history, the literature, and the influence of the Jews from the close of that period to our own day.

The book was planned by that erudite and lovable scholar Dr. I. ABRAHAMS, who did not live to see its completion, and it has been edited by Dr. E. R. BEVAN and Dr. Charles SINGER, who also make substantial and notable contributions to its pages. It is a sign of the magnanimous and unsectarian spirit in which the project was conceived and carried out that Christian as well as Jewish voices are heard throughout the volume. This is as it should be; for the legacy of Judaism, as this volume abundantly proves, is a legacy to the whole world, and very particularly to the Christian world. And, as one of the writers points out, the Jewish legacy is not one which was bequeathed once and for all, to be appropriated and assimilated by us moderns as a gift from the olden time, but it is a legacy which all down the ages, and to-day no less than ever, is still being imparted by Jews to those who have ears to hear. It is indeed as much leaven as legacy.

The Christian world has by no means always been as grateful as it should have been for that legacy. For centuries it repaid its benefactors with the blackest ingratitude and with persecution as cruel as it was disgraceful. It is too much to expect that a people of so intensely ethical a passion as the Jews should have been led to embrace a religion

which was commended to them by methods so atrocious. Of the book entitled 'The Valley of Weeping,' the Rev. R. T. HERFORD in one of the Essays remarks that 'the story of horror is told with a dull monotony in which all separate incidents are merged in one long agony of grief.' In other books incidents are recorded without remark which are beyond belief and intolerable to quote. 'That the Jews could endure under centuries of such treatment is proof of the influence of their religion upon them, when they could have saved themselves at once by giving up the struggle and being baptized.'

The rich variety of the book, which is introduced in a 'Prologue' by the Master of Balliol, will be sufficiently obvious from the Table of Contents. It is opened by a characteristically eloquent chapter on 'The Hebrew Genius as exhibited in the Old Testament,' by Sir George Adam SMITH, marked by all the insight and imagination which we are accustomed to expect from his expositions of the letter or the spirit of the Old Testament. Dr. E. R. BEVAN offers a survey of Hellenistic Judaism, which contains a particularly able and discriminating study of Philo. Professor BURKITT follows with 'The Debt of Christianity to Judaism'—the debt to early Judaism being Jesus and the Old Testament, while to Rabbinical Judaism the debt lies in the gradual recovery of a better text and the more scientific interpretation of the Old Testament.

In 'The Influence of Judaism upon Jews in the Period from Hillel to Mendelssohn,' Mr. HERFORD tells a moving tale of their sorrows and sufferings, of the yellow badge and the ghetto, and of their unconquerable optimism through eighteen centuries. Full of suggestion and interest is Professor GUILLAUME'S chapter on 'The Influence of Judaism on Islam,' in which he emphasizes the striking similarity between the Talmud and the Hadith, and shows how, in prayer, cult, and much else, Muhammadan practice was profoundly influenced by the Jews.

Dr. and Mrs. SINGER discuss at great length and with much learning 'The Jewish Factor in Mediæval Thought. Dr. SINGER deals also with 'Hebrew Scholarship in the Middle Ages among Latin Christians,' while Canon Box follows these essays up with an equally learned and interesting chapter on 'Hebrew Studies in the Reformation Period and After.' These three chapters, through which pass many famous figures, for example, Averroes, Maimonides, Abraham ben Ezra, Roger Bacon, Raymond Lull, Nicholas of Lyra, Pico della Mirandola, Reuchlin, Luther, Melanchthon, the Buxtorfs, etc., reveal the almost incredible industry and erudition of the Jewish and Christian scholars of the Middle Ages and the Reformation Period.

Professor ISAACS of Harvard throws much curious light on 'The Influence of Judaism on Western Law,' while Principal SELBIE illustrates 'The Influence of the Old Testament on Puritanism' in its attitude to liberty, vengeance, witchcraft, war, persecution, the Sunday, etc. A chapter of quite unusual interest and importance is by Dr. Leon ROTH on 'Jewish Thought in the Modern World.' In this he shows how deep is our debt to the fundamental ideas of the Old Testament within the region not only of ethics but of scientific thought as well.

A short but suggestive paper by Professor MEILLET of Paris on 'The Influence of the Hebrew Bible on European Languages' is followed by a fresh study of 'The Legacy in Modern Literature' from the pen of Mr. Laurie MAGNUS, who shows how greatly the language and thought—and not least the political thought—of modern literature are saturated with the language and thought of the Old Testament. The volume is fittingly closed by an epilogue in which Mr. MONTEFIORE forcibly pleads, as he has done before, that the work of Judaism is not yet done, but that it may still exercise a more direct influence upon the world's religious future than it has done in the last sixteen hundred years.

It is obviously impossible to review, in the ordinary sense of the word, a book whose contents are so rich and varied. All that we can hope to do is to record a few impressions and offer a few quotations which will indicate the flavour of this important volume, whose value as an interpreta-

tion of Judaism is enormously enhanced by eighty-three remarkable illustrations.

The first point to which we would call attention is Dr. BEVAN's fine characterization of the essential elements of the Hebraic view of the world. They are three: (1) An apprehension of God as righteous Will; (2) a conception of the world-process as a process in Time, which embodies a Divine plan beginning in God's mighty act of creation and leading up to a great consummation in the future; and (3) an association of the Divine plan with a Divine community, a 'people of God' chosen to be the vehicle of God's purpose, so that the ultimate consummation is a communal bliss, the community redeemed, blessed, and glorious.

The mysterious Cabala which seems so remote and impalpable to those who have not seriously studied it, is attractively presented by Canon Box as revealing the mystical side of Judaism and as marking the reaction against a dry and arid scholasticism. He reminds us that some of the most exquisite prayers and liturgical poems of the synagogue liturgy are the productions of the Cabalists, and he quotes the contention of J. Abelson that 'if it is true to say that Judaism here and there suffers from too large an element of formalism and legalism and externalism, it is equally true to say that many of these drawbacks are corrected, toned down, by the contributions of mysticism.'

In the chapter on 'The Legacy in Modern Literature,' Mr. MAGNUS makes some suggestive remarks about the curious power of the Bible to associate moral ideas with the names of things. In its summons not to live by bread alone nor to eat the bread of idleness, it 'standardized the loaf's spiritual value. . . . Bread, wine, and the rest were not merely what the dictionary called them; they were sublimated, or consecrated, into a call to virtuous living.'

In another chapter Dr. BEVAN reminds us that the problem with which the Jews of the Dispersion were brought face to face through their contact with Hellenism was just 'the first brunt in a conflict in which we too are engaged. For their problem is still in a way our problem. In the civilization of the European peoples the Hebrew and Greek traditions have entered into combination, but their mutual adjustment still raises questions on which men are not agreed.'

In some ways the most striking claim for Judaism made in the volume is that by Dr. ROTH when he contends for its influence upon scientific thought. This honour is usually claimed for Hellenism, but Dr. ROTH argues that 'the very background of modern scientific ideology is Hebraic. As a matter of history this derives not from the scientific monism of Greece but from the transcendental monotheism of Israel. The ideal of absolute cosmic regularity, so far as it has reached general thought, is of theological origin.' And again, 'Whatever idea of the spiritual has reached the masses of the European peoples is due to the Jewish view of the character of supreme reality. In the light of this achievement all else pales.'

Throughout all the chequered history of the Hebrews one spirit has run. As the Master of Balliol well puts it in his 'Prologue': 'There is a world of difference between the dramatic passion and the poetic imagery of the Book of Job and the austere and ordered reasonings of Spinoza's Ethic; but in that rare combination of unflinching truthfulness and religious reverence the two books are alike, and in the strength of that combination they breathe an assurance of trust and confidence which is the more precious because it has been so hardly won.'

In view of the stupendous influence that Israel has exercised upon the thought and life of the world—an influence abundantly illustrated by this volume—Canon Box's eloquent plea for 'the rehabilitation of Hebrew studies as occupying an essential place in sound learning, and above all in studies which have the Bible as their foundation,' is very much to the point. He shows what an essential element the study of Hebrew was in the Humanistic Movement which found expression in the Renaissance and the Reformation. That study,

like the study of Greek and Latin, brought men who were weary of the arid logomachies and futilities of scholasticism face to face with reality; and the spiritual heirs of the Reformers will never, let us hope, abandon the study of a language which enshrines a literature that has left so powerful a mark upon the mind and spirit of man.

Dr. Rendel Harris has published in pamphlet form a little book on *Eucharistic Origins* (Heffer; 3s. net), in which he traverses Bousset's opinion that in the present state of our knowledge we are obliged to give up all hope of ascertaining the original meaning of the Last Supper. It is an opinion shared by other liberal and radical critics of the New Testament documents; and it must be reckoned with by those, in particular, who would maintain the 'Dominical' institution of the Eucharist as a Sacrament, in the Catholic sense of a 'generally necessary' means of objective grace.

But Dr. Harris's views as to the original meaning of the Last Supper will not be welcome to conservative critics, and will be obnoxious to those who believe in our Lord's institution of the Eucharist as a means of grace. For a critical examination of the Eucharistic texts in the Gospels and 1 Corinthians leads him to the conclusion that what Jesus did and said was simply this: 'He took a cup and said, "This is my Soma."' And by this Jesus meant nothing suggestive of the Catholic idea of Sacrament, but only that the end was come and immortality was at hand.

We cannot take space to show how Dr. Harris reaches his critical reduction of the Eucharistic texts, but we may indicate how he reaches his novel interpretation of what he regards as the primitive text. It is by writing σῶμα (sōma) with a capital letter and understanding it as the 'great Aryan Sacrament,' and as signifying immortality.

'We have drunk Soma, we have become immortal,
We have pressed through to the light, we have found the gods (*Rig-Veda*).'

That is to say, Jesus was speaking of the Indian, Avestan, Indo-Germanic *Soma*, and not of His *body*.

Thus, according to Dr. Harris's restoration of the original form of the Eucharist, our Lord used a mystical expression, an occult saying, a figure of speech expressing the situation in which He found Himself: 'He appears to have invited the disciples to drink Soma with Him, *i.e.* to die with Him, and with Him to enter upon an immortal life. They did drink, but, as in so many other cases, they only understood in part. From that partial misunderstanding sprang, in a little while, the "Hoc est corpus meum," and the Mass.'

Dr. Harris is quite sensible that his suggestions 'for the simplification of the history of the Eucharist and for making it at once intelligible and reasonable' are open to a very damaging fire of objections. Did the term *Soma*, in the sense of the 'elixir of immortality' of the Pagan mysteries such as the Bacchic, exist either in Greek or in Syriac? Could it have formed part of our Lord's religious vocabulary? Are we justified in drawing analogies between Greek and Indian cults, or, more specifically, in assuming a dependence of Greek Bacchic rites upon Aryan origins?

The Sacramental Controversy before A.D. 1.

By Herbert Loewe, M.A., Oxford.

That the Jewish student should be interested in the recent discussions on the Prayer Book is by no means strange. The world has progressed to a recognition that there are no water-tight bulkheads between religions: we are beginning to think not merely imperially but universally. After the war we learnt that we had, against our will, to trade with our former enemies in order to avoid our own economic ruin, and if in matters of the purse we discover the futility of political frontiers, how much more, as the Rabbis would say, must there be interaction in the spiritual realm? If hatred thaws in the warmth of human needs, can love remain chill and isolated? In religion the whole is often affected by the parts. A survey of the centuries will show how frequently stagnation and rottenness or revival and strength in one creed have had contemporary parallels in others. A virile Christianity promotes a virile Judaism. Ideas cannot be pent within a narrow circle. Hence the growth of a new religious development in Christianity is by no means a thing of indifference to the Jew. He seeks to study and to understand the causes and the issues, and he realizes that there may well be implications for his own faith in a movement that, at first sight, seems far removed from him. Moreover, the Established Church is a British institution, and the British Jew regards it with a reverence that many Churches in other lands fail to arouse in the Jews who live under their shadow. Finally, there is some indefinable characteristic about British Christianity—established or non-conformist—that profoundly interests the Jew. The British Christian and the British Jew seem to possess a kindred theological outlook and method.

But the last thing that a Jewish student would wish to do is to interfere in the domestic privacies of others. They have much that he can study, but much that he cannot comprehend. Just as keenly as he welcomes others who desire to understand Judaism, so strongly would he resent their dictation of the form which his creed should assume or the ceremonies which his Synagogue should carry out or discard. The Jewish Member of Parliament had an obvious solution for his dilemma, a dilemma which was moral and not legal; he had but to consult the vicars and churchwardens of his constituency, and to vote in accordance with their wishes. Neutrality for Jewish citizens has not always been easy to achieve. Thus, when the doctrine of papal infallibility was proclaimed, in many towns on the Continent the Catholics illuminated their houses, while the Protestants naturally abstained from doing so. What could the Jews do to indicate their passive attitude? They could not merely refrain from putting candles in their windows, for this negative action definitely committed them to one party.

To-day if a Jewish student ventures to write on one aspect of the Prayer Book controversy it is from purely historical motives. The parallels seem worth recording from the literary point of view: they are not set out to provide partisan ammunition. And if the present writer seems to favour one side rather than the other it is because this reading of the facts suggests itself to him. The reading may be wrong, but the facts are valid and perhaps may be thought worth while collecting.

Most people are agreed that the driving force which impelled the majority in the Commons to veto the Prayer Book was an objection to the reservation of the Sacrament. Whether, as some hold, the objectors understood or, as others hold, they failed to understand the meaning of reservation and of sacrament, is for the present purposes irrelevant. The fact remains that this question, in the end, determined the result. Those who point to the geographical composition of the majority, to the 'Protestant underworld,' to the effect of good oratory *versus* tactical blunders or to other non-essentials are really evading the issue. The Home Secretary and his followers took their stand on the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Sacrament and on this point alone were votes given or withheld ultimately.

Apart from practical considerations and the intensely difficult situation in the Church, there is an historical side to this question, which is not devoid of interest. Nothing is entirely new under the sun, and there is a periodicity in the ebb and flow of ideas which is often amazing and of which the battle of the Prayer Book furnishes an illuminating example. The sacramental question of to-day is not, after all, a creation of the twentieth century, nor is it even a revival of the central controversy of the Reformation; the clash of thought began over two thousand years ago.

But can one speak of a sacramental controversy in Judaism? The premises seem unsound, at the very outset. Judaism knows no sacraments, the twelve volumes of the Jewish Encyclopedia contain no article under the heading Sacrament; how, then, can we speak of a pre-Christian Sacramental controversy? Judaism knows of ceremonies; one might possibly go so far as to say that, for example, the rite of circumcision and the Priestly Benediction were 'outward and visible signs of an inward and spiritual grace,' though some would maintain that this is pushing the idea of *Kawwanah* too far.

But in no case would Judaism admit that the Grace was 'inherent in the external symbolical thing or act as well as in the faithful who receive or do it,' according to the definition of the Latin Church. There is no *musterion* of the Greek Church in the act of *Kiddush*, and if certain Jews kiss the Scroll of the Law as it is carried past them to the lectern, they are merely acting as two continental gentlemen would do when meeting or parting. English Jews are more restrained in their social etiquette and religious ceremonial. Nevertheless, although Judaism lacks sacraments now, it does not follow that it has lacked them always. There was a sacramental tendency in *Kabbalah*, but it made little if any general headway. Yet there was a time when Judaism certainly did possess sacraments, only this time is so long distant that for practical purposes no memories can be said to survive.

Christianity was born at a time when men had long fought for the retention or abolition of certain ceremonies in worship, because of the belief in the Real Presence which these ceremonies were intended to express. The High Churchman to-day is the spiritual descendant of the Sadducees; the Evangelicals represent the principles of the Pharisees. Then as now the subject in dispute was the doctrine that underlay the culminating act of public worship; then, as now, this act was performed by one party as a symbol, and by the other as a Sacramental mystery. The parallel grows all the more striking the more it is studied.

On the Day of Atonement, the most solemn day in the Jewish calendar, the High Priest, in accordance with the prescriptions of Leviticus, entered the Holy of Holies, to seek forgiveness for the sins of the people. His threefold confession and prayer for pardon were accompanied, amongst other things, by the offering of incense. According to Lv 16^{12}, the High Priest was commanded to take 'a censer full of coals of fire from off the altar before the Lord, and his hands full of sweet incense beaten small, and bring it within the veil: and he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy-seat that is upon the testimony.' This simple ordinance was the subject of long and vigorous dispute between the Sadducees and the Pharisees, it was the 'dividing line' between them, and the point at issue was exactly that of to-day, did the High Priest or did he not perform an act which brought him into physical—not merely spiritual—contact with the Supreme Being? How was this distinction manifested? The Sadducees held that the High Priest was to kindle the incense in the vessel outside the Holy of Holies, so that he might come within the Veil wrapped in a cloud of smoke. The Pharisees insisted that the incense must be kindled within the Holy of Holies. The difference seems slight, but behind it lay two diametrically opposed conceptions of God. Professor Lauterbach's recent article in the *Hebrew Union College Annual* (Cincinnati) may be said to be the final word on this subject. His views are as follows: The Sadducees taught that God Himself was present within the Veil, because 'in the cloud (of incense) will I appear upon the Mercy Seat' (*ib.* verse 2); that the Priest did see God, and that he alone could see God and only at that place and at that moment: that the Divine hierarchy was present and that death might follow any irreverence or neglect of duty by the High Priest. Hence as a servant would never be so deficient in respect as to prepare incense for an earthly master in his presence, so, *a fortiori*, must the High Priest approach God Himself with the preliminaries decently accomplished outside the Veil. The smoke of the incense was to screen him from the Deity. This doctrine was uncompromisingly rejected by the Pharisees, who taught that God is everywhere, that the whole earth is full of His Glory and that He is approachable by all men at all times. Accordingly they denied the 'Real Presence,' *i.e.* that God or any 'visible representation of Him or any visible representation of His Glory could actually be seen in the Holy of Holies hovering over the Ark-cover, or, in the Second Temple, when the Ark was no more, on the *Eben Shethiyah* stone' that marked the site of the Ark (Lauterbach). Therefore the Pharisees were opposed to any practice that might lend colour to this anthropomorphic view. They taught a purer conception of the Godhead, and so they insisted that the incense should be kindled within the Veil, so that even the faintest suggestion of corporeal contact with the Deity be definitely repudiated.

It must be remembered that the Sadducees were the conservative priests. They stood for the Temple and the Temple ritual, the old-fashioned beliefs and practices of the past, the dignity and privileges of the priesthood and the status of the aristocracy. The Pharisees were laymen, mostly sprung from the poorer classes, evangelical in outlook and progressive in thought. The Sadducees stood for the Temple, and the Pharisees for the Bible. General verdicts on the two parties are perilous; there were good men and bad men in each, but personal merit does not come into the question. The fact to be noted is that the Pharisees were determined to purge religion from anthropomorphic elements which had crept in and become stereotyped. They took their stand upon the spirit, which they claimed was implicit in the Scriptures. This interpretation was their 'tradition,' which the Sadducees, who were literalists, rejected.

This matter of the incense, then, was a typical instance of the clash between Sadducee and Pharisee that turned upon the conception of God. There were others. The Sadducees claimed that the cost of the daily offering devolved on the High Priest, whereas the Pharisees declared it to be an item of national expenditure: the Sadducees claimed the meal as the priests' offering, attaching almost a sacramental value to the sacrifice, while the Pharisees assigned it to the laity. They ascribed less sanctity to the Scrolls of the Law than did the Pharisees. In these and in other instances the underlying motives were extraordinarily similar to those which divide Protestants from Catholics. We may note the Sadducean emphasis on the status of the Priest and his order and on the efficacy of the priests' actions, the endeavour to solve the problem of transcendence by anthropomorphism and sacrament; correspondingly there was the Evangelical tendency of the Pharisees, who, as laymen, stressed the religious claims of the people as opposed to the Ecclesiastics, the drawing of authority from the Bible and the Holy Spirit, and the attainment of immanence by inward means. All this seems peculiarly modern: it is, in fact, nothing but a primitive difference in the human outlook towards God. Variety of this outlook there has always been and there must always be. To seek for uniformity is futile. The value of history lies largely in the lessons which it may give for future guidance, and in this case, too, one may with profit look back and see how these mutually incompatible views of the Real Presence adjusted themselves. Now the Sadducees were in power before the Pharisees. The latter, growing up slowly but surely, probably long after the return from exile, gradually acquired authority. Between the Sanhedrin, mostly Pharisee, and the priesthood there arose a situation comparable to that which the Church of England would furnish if the Bishops were all Anglo-Catholic and the House of Commons entirely Protestant; in other words, if the recent Prayer Book vote were a normal incident in the working of Church and State. The Pharisees used every year before the Day of Atonement to exact an oath from the High Priest that he would introduce no Sadducean ritual into the service. On one occasion a Sadducean High Priest did so successfully, but he was rebuked by his father for, as we should say, disturbing the balance of the compromise. How long this concordat would have lasted we cannot say. No doubt the Pharisees would have ended by capturing the priesthood, because the Sadducean party was limited in number and, on the whole, less inclined to religion than were the Pharisees. But the significant fact is that when Jerusalem was captured by Titus, the Sadducees simply disappeared. They had built their faith on the Temple, and when the Temple fell they fell with it. The Pharisees built on the Bible, and they have survived to this day, for all Judaism, that of Jesus and that of the Rabbis, that of the Liberals and that of the Zionists, is Pharisaic. The Sadducees restricted the Real Presence to one place, and without that place they were lost. The Pharisees saw God everywhere, and thus amid two millennia of persecution their faith has kept them alive.

Literature.

FIVE CENTURIES OF RELIGION.

'NOTHING,' says Dr. G. G. Coulton in volume ii. of his *Five Centuries of Religion* (Cambridge University Press; 31s. 6d. net), 'can quite replace the study of actual texts.' The reader who embarks on the study of this massive and beautifully printed volume may do so with the assurance that he is reading the words of a scholar who has a unique knowledge of the original documents on which he bases his extraordinarily interesting and illuminating discussion of 'The Friars and the Dead Weight of Tradition from 1200 to 1400 A.D.,' which is the subtitle of the volume. The picture on the whole is a dark one, and those who resented the conclusions reached in the first volume are faithfully and trenchantly dealt with in the Preface and in other parts of this volume.

Dr. Coulton has no desire to paint the picture darker than it really is; he is not slow to give credit where credit is due; but when he deals with the uglier side of the religious life of those two centuries, he does not rest his case on the indictments of the professional satirists, but on the words of contemporaries who were deeply interested in the welfare of the Orders whose conduct they sorrowfully denounce. Over against the beauty of the life of St. Francis, which has stirred the Protestants of to-day as profoundly as the Roman Catholics, have to be set many incontrovertible evidences of the unhealthy state of monasticism. There are charges of rioting and drunkenness. 'They turn these houses of hospitality and piety into dens of thieves, brothels of harlots and synagogues of Jews.' 'The nun who has no devotee—nay, seducer—holdeth herself as one deserted.' There is a long and carefully documented appendix of discussion, consisting largely of quotations and extending to nearly one hundred and fifty pages, which substantiate the more general indictment of the earlier chapters; and he will have to be a good medieval scholar indeed who will seek to invalidate Dr. Coulton's argument.

Here we read of the Abbot as Baron, of the Monk as Squire, of Monk and Peasant, of the Poor Clares, of the Friars' Decay, of the difficulties of Discipline and of the Visitors' Methods, of how the Orders became increasingly identified with the growing capitalistic system, of how the monks rack-rented their tenants, of how tribute was exacted from concubinary clergy—of these and of many other things. Incidentally, too, a few common fallacies are exploded: we are reminded, for example, that 'the theory that the worship of the Virgin Mary worked, in any decisive degree, to raise the status of women is quite irreconcilable with the facts.' There is also a brief but valuable discussion of the Stigmatization of St. Francis, written in the true historical temper which refuses to go beyond the facts, and reminding the curious that 'no single witness is both (1) an eye-witness, and (2) a describer of the plastically formed nails.' The skill and interest with which the long and complicated story of two centuries is sustained almost conceal from the reader the enormous erudition which underlies it. This volume, like its predecessor, is of the highest historical value and of the deepest human interest.

A THEOLOGICAL STORM-CENTRE.

Bishop Barnes has for some years been making himself increasingly unpopular with a considerable section of his fellow-churchmen. This is not, probably, because of his general theological breadth. He is not broader than many others, than Dean Inge for instance, in regard to doctrine and criticism. His unpopularity is due to the bluntness with which he has criticised one particular belief, the Anglo-Catholic doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The protest made against his teaching on this point rests on several grounds. For one thing, his opponents say that a bishop should not take sides in such a dispute. Further, they declare that he is attacking a belief which has been tolerated for long in the Church of England. And, finally, they object to the 'brutality' of his language.

The Bishop is quite unrepentant, as he shows by the publication of the most criticised of his recent utterances, and of much else on the same lines, in his new book with the curious title *Should such a Faith Offend?* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). In the preface to this book he vigorously (and successfully) vindicates his right as a bishop to deal with the great issues of faith, and to repudiate and expose errors. He also contends that the Anglo-Catholic doctrine of the Holy Supper is not an allowed belief in the Church of England. And he repeats, and amplifies, the reprobated terms in which he characterized this belief as grossly materialistic, magical, and superstitious.

The book is full of interest throughout, as may

be imagined. There is not a dull page in it. Nor is there anything really new. Indeed, the chief feeling the reader has on laying it down is one of surprise that so much should be said of Bishop Barnes's 'heresies.' They are for the most part the accepted views of all educated and open-minded people. If we except for the moment the sacramental essays, the book is mainly occupied in expounding the relations of religion and science. The Bishop shows clearly that there is no real conflict between them, if we accept the ascertained results of science. We have to give up out-worn systems like the Augustinian scheme reared on the doctrine of the Fall. But all that happens is that Christian faith is purified and simplified. We apologize for stating this obvious truth. But the fact that its reiteration in this book has been received with such disfavour only goes to show how urgently the pulpit needs to teach the plain realities of the modern religious situation. The Bishop's new book will do an immense deal of good if it clears the mind of the average man on this matter.

Bishop Barnes has not only courage. He possesses a clear and cogent mind, and expresses himself in direct and plain words that carry his meaning. This virtue is no doubt part of his offence. But in a day when the big things in religion are at stake, and when so many are willing to listen to an authentic voice, it is good to find some one who speaks of these things without any ambiguity, with fearless honesty, and (we add) with a positive and loyal assertion of the main Christian certainty, the Divine nature and authority of the Lord Jesus Christ.

WOODBROOKE STUDIES.

Apart from the Bible manuscripts, many apocryphal and pseudepigraphical writings have been preserved to us in Syriac. Within recent years, however, a new impetus has been given to this horizon of Biblical knowledge by the scholarly translations of Dr. Mingana, of the John Rylands Library, Manchester, who is thus making available to us his valuable collection of manuscripts at present in the custody of the Rendel Harris Library, Selly Oak, Birmingham. All interested in these manuscripts, and especially those acquainted with his 'Early Judæo-Christian Documents,' translated from Syriac texts, will welcome his *Woodbrooke Studies*, the first volume of which has just been issued (Heffer; 10s. 6d. net). These Studies consist of Christian documents in Syriac, Arabic, and Garshūni, which Dr. Mingana is editing and translating with a critical apparatus. The first volume, which is dedicated to Mr. Edward Cadbury, contains Barṣaliba's Treatise against the Melchites, some genuine and apocryphal works of Ignatius of Antioch, a Jeremiah Apocryphon, a new life of John the Baptist, and some uncanonical psalms, all translated into excellent English, with an introduction to each by Dr. Rendel Harris. Barṣaliba's Treatise throws considerable light on the Monophysite and allied controversies as they affected the Greek and Eastern Churches in the fifth century. This good Syrian father, belonging to the West Syrian Church, with its Monophysite Christology of only one nature (God-man), and its exaltation of the Virgin to celestial rank, writes ten chapters against the Melchites, a small group of Syrian believers who had accepted the Chalcedon creed of two natures (God-and-man), but who at the same time claimed protection and patronage by attachment to the State Church and the Imperial city. His treatise is largely concerned with the trivialities of ritual, but one cannot but be impressed with his noble Christlike spirit as well as his dialectical skill. The works of Ignatius which follow are probably apocryphal, for, as Dr. Rendel Harris reminds us, so many spurious interpolations and additions have accumulated round this martyr bishop's name that some critics, such as W. R. Cassels in 'Supernatural Religion,' have regarded all the writings bearing his name as false. The principal Ignatius document given is an exhortation to priests and deacons to practise personal piety and not to be led away into immoral actions. It is interesting in several ways. For one thing, it quotes the Gospels in a harmonized form (Matthew + Luke), independent of Tatian's 'Harmony.' The writer is also acquainted with the 'Odes of Solomon,' the greatest of all Syriac writings, and adopts the anti-Judaic Wednesday and Friday fasts, and the displacement of Sabbath by Sunday. The Jeremiah Apocryphon is an Apocalyptic document which deals with the fortunes of exiled Israel and their hopes of resuscitation and return. It is a Christian Arabic book, written in Garshūni, *i.e.* the popular Arabic language but in Syriac characters, a method sometimes adopted so as to escape Moslem criticism, and it has probably a Greek text underlying it. The story tells the sufferings of Jeremiah, the horrors of the Exile, and the privations and toil of the people. The new life of John the Baptist, in Garshūni also, by one Serapion, an Egyptian bishop near the close of the fourth century, is a mixture of history and legend, probably translated from Greek, and with interpolations by authors or

copyists of a later date. The writer has dipped accurately into the Bible account, but has also blended with it a large amount of apocryphal detail as to the Baptist's diet, the burial of Elisabeth by her seven-year-old child, the preservation of the Baptist's head, and other matters. Dr. Mingana gives us five uncanonical psalms, the first of which is a thanksgiving by David for the defeat of Goliath. This one, which seems to come originally from the Greek, is found in many manuscripts of the Syrian Psalter, where it is numbered the 151st, and was even translated into Scottish last century by Dr. Hately Waddell. The thought and diction of all five are good, and in reading one or two of them, which show fine Hebrew parallelism and have probably come direct from the Hebrew, we might almost fancy we were perusing our own Psalter. These *Woodbrooke Studies* add materially to our knowledge of Christian literature in the early centuries and should be in every Biblical scholar's library. They are so excellently done that any criticism of them would be out of place. The volume is beautifully illustrated with the original texts in full, and the introductions of Dr. Rendel Harris, as might be expected, are most interesting masterpieces of exposition and criticism.

DEAN INGE.

Dean Inge's utterances, by their range and piquancy, strike the taste of a very wide public; and if his sayings are occasionally bitter—on the whole it is a tonic bitterness which sensible people feel to be a wholesome cathartic for uncritical thinking. His new volume of Essays—*The Church in the World* (Longmans; 6s. net)—confined almost wholly to religious subjects, lacks perhaps the popular appeal of his former excursions into politics, ethics, and eugenics, but in its own restricted domain it has all the well-known characteristics of the Dean's style of thinking and expression—his direct pungency, his epigrammatic power of condensing his criticism of a party or a philosophy into a few memorable sentences—his fearless freedom from decorous and expected platitudes, his faith in reason—are all here and command admiration even if they do not always win consent. The Essays are eight in number and can be treated in two main groups. The first group comprises Essays I., III., IV., and VIII. Essay III. deals with the Quakers, of whom he says more than once that 'they are the truest Christians in the modern world,' though he disagrees with their view that 'force is no remedy,' and that capital punishment is wrong. Their reliance on experience rather than on authority in religion and their rational acceptance of science as a source of truth are pleasing to the Dean and to us all. He sees in them Christian Platonists in disguise and hails them as Friends indeed. It is a generous tribute, for which we all thank him. The last Essay is a wise exposition of the true aims of education, with a dash of enlightened patriotism, as becomes one who is conscious of the rich heritage of the race to which he belongs.

The fourth Essay, on 'Hellenism and Christianity,' reminds us of our debt as Christians to Helles as well as to Judea. 'Thy sons, oh Zion, against thy sons, oh Greece' seems in this plea of the Dean's to be reversed. It is a characteristic Essay, and the main contention underlying it runs like a refrain through this volume. Christianity is more an Hellenic and Platonic religion than a Judean. Paul was more a Greek than a Jew. Modern Christianity is suffering from the fact that the Erasmic and Renaissance sweet reasonableness did not gain a hearing in the bitter contentions of Protestant and Catholic. The sane stream of Christianity flowed through Platonism. One feels that the thesis is overpressed. After all, Hebraism had something to do with Christianity, and it is possible on the broad ground of history to contend that Platonism, valuable as it is, was made alive, and is kept alive, by the New Spirit which historically had its origin in Judea. 'Salvation is of the Jews.' The first Essay, 'The Condition of the Church of England,' is perhaps the most interesting in the volume, both for its own sake and on account of the present situation in that communion.

The second group of Essays, II., V., VI., and VII., is more concerned with the philosophy of religion, and we welcome on the one hand Dean Inge's trenchant criticism of naturalism, and on the other his warm appreciation of science. He is surely right in insisting that religion and science as organs of truth cannot be kept in water-tight compartments, in his plea that God is more than His manifestation of Himself in the world either of Nature or of history, and in his repudiation of truth as something created by our wishes and values. 'God is the *valor valorum* and the *ens realissimum*,' not a creation to suit our taste or our wishes, but the Ultimate Reality. All through there runs the plea for the rehabilitation of rational mysticism and Platonism, but if he repeats this in every Essay we do not get tired of it, for, as a king of France said of his favourite preacher: 'I would rather listen

to his repetitions than to most other men's novelties'; so we say of Dean Inge, only we feel like asking him what really is his view of religious revelation, and whether there is anything after all in the old antithesis of revelation and reason.

A NEW SAMARITAN TEXT.

There can be few, if any, people living to-day who know as much about the Samaritans as Moses Gaster, Ph.D. His Schweich Lectures, delivered a few years ago, dealt with their History, Doctrines, and Literature, and he has now put us still further in his debt by the publication of *The Asatir: The Samaritan Book of the 'Secrets of Moses,' together with the Pitron or Samaritan Commentary and the Samaritan Story of the Death of Moses* (Royal Asiatic Society, 74 Grosvenor Street, London, W. 1). The Asatir is a pseudepigraphical collection, in Samaritan, of Biblical legends—a sort of legendary supplement to the Pentateuch—ascribed to Moses. It was discovered by Dr. Gaster among the Samaritans in 1907, and the original Samaritan text, which is often extremely difficult and obscure, is presented here, with the much fuller Samaritan commentary, in a very readable translation.

Dr. Gaster has expended much learning in tracing the connexion between the Asatir and literature whose material is in part more or less cognate, notably the Sibylline Oracles and parts of the Antiquities of Josephus; and he makes out a very good case for the thesis that this Samaritan book is one of the hitherto unsuspected sources of portions of the Oracles, while Josephus drew from a source not indeed identical with, but closely approximating to, the Asatir. The aim of the Asatir, which 'could not have been compiled later than between 250–200 B.C.,' is in part polemical. Prominent in it is the holiness of Mount Garizim, and hatred against the Temple in Jerusalem: it emphasizes the truth of the Samaritan claims to be the possessors of the genuine text of the Bible and the strict observers of the Law. Among other points of interest the figure of Antichrist is traced back to the story of Balaam. The linguistic discussion and the transliteration of a portion of the Samaritan text will be of special interest to philologists. The text of the Samaritan description of the death of Moses appears here for the first time.

There are several errata—due no doubt to the fact that the book was printed in Leipzig—which should be corrected in a subsequent edition: synchretistic (pp. 13, 39, 64), seqeunce (p. 16), idolators (p. 34), Sammaritans (p. 103), gutterals (p. 127), indispensible (p. 157); a few faulty divisions, for example, soug htin (p. 126), theo ther (p. 160), ol doriginal (p. 164); omissions of letters, for example, th contents (p. 127), nterpret (p. 167), Thou who was (p. 315), while on p. 317 'O Thou the of the house of Levi,' a word corresponding to יקיר has dropped out between 'the' and 'of.'

Students of the history of Midrash should give this book a cordial welcome, and Dr. Gaster is to be congratulated not only on this fine piece of pioneer work but on presenting in the notes to his translation many parallels from Samaritan literature, much of which is, even to well-equipped students, practically inaccessible.

THE EUCHARIST.

In his book, *The Protestant Doctrine of the Lord's Supper* (Jackson, Wylie & Co., Glasgow; 10s. 6d. net), the Rev. Alexander Barclay, B.D., Ph.D., offers a study in the Eucharistic teaching of Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin, in which he supplies for English students of the Reformation doctrine of the Sacraments a conspectus of material such as is to be readily found only in French and German text-books. The book is chiefly occupied with the exposition of Calvin's Eucharistic views, and the exposition is based—as indeed also in the cases of Luther and Zwingli—on an examination of his writings according to the chronological order, as determined by modern research. There is also a good discussion of the question how far Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper is Scriptural, as also of the question whether Calvin was in this doctrine self-consistent, and by way of appendix to the volume the points of contact between the Eucharistic teaching of Ratramnus in the eighth century and that of Calvin in the sixteenth are set forth.

The aim of the book might be succinctly expressed as follows: it is to show that in the matter of the Lord's Supper Luther became a Lutheran, that Zwingli was never a Zwinglian (in the sense that his theory is one of Mere Commemoration), and that Calvin was ever a Calvinist. It belongs to these same positions that there was essential agreement among the Reformers on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and that their differences were not so pronounced as the traditional interpretations would have them to be.

Dr. Barclay maintains his thesis with consistency and with theological competence; but, apart from that, we are indebted to him for the material which he has placed so conveniently to the hand of the English teacher and student, especially as it reflects

a careful and diligent use of the documentary sources. Particularly to be commended is the discussion in chapter xvi. of the relation of Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper to that of Luther. The book is furnished with a valuable bibliographical list.

THE TWELVE APOSTLES.

Dr. Rendel Harris has applied his great learning and critical ingenuity to the problem of the composition of the first Christian apostolate. His work is entitled *The Twelve Apostles* (Heffer; 7s. 6d. net), and proceeds on the assumption that the accounts of the 'Dodecad' in the Gospels may have been subject to legendary accretion. The main motive for such accretion would appear to have been, according to Dr. Harris, the emergence of the doctrine of the Virgin Birth and the consequent necessity of eliminating from the original catalogues of the Apostles anything that seemed derogatory to Jesus and Mary—for example, the implication that Jesus was not the first-born of Mary or that Jesus and Judas were twins. Dr. Harris regards the tradition of the existence of a body of twelve apostles as very early and very widely diffused, but he discovers in the traditional list what appear to be three titles which are not properly names at all, to wit, Thomas (twin-brother), Thaddæus (foster-brother), and Bartholomew (son of Tolmai); and he offers the opinion that the apostolic catalogue, as we have it in the Gospels, would, when done into popular English, read something like this: Simon Peter, James McZebedee and John McZebedee, Andrew, Philip, McTolmai (a title), Matthew, Twin-brother (a title), James McSubstitute (that is James son of Alphæus-Cleophas), Foster-brother (a title), Simon the Radical, and Judas the Traitor. 'Write the list in this way,' says Dr. Harris, 'and the fantastic and unscientific character of the original becomes evident. At the same time, the historical elements can be seen through the peculiarities of the list. For we can see that James is the son of Joseph and Mary, thinly disguised, and that the Foster-brother is a second stage meant to eliminate the twin, who must not really be called so.'

There are many points of interest in this volume, apart altogether from its attempt to reconstruct the apostolic college, and one cannot but be attracted by Dr. Harris' methods and intrigued by his manner. He himself is well aware that he moves in a world of conjecture, but it is his conviction that all possible hypotheses with regard to the origin and diffusion of Christianity should be made and tested.

OLD TESTAMENT IN GREEK.

The first part of the second volume of *The Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge University Press; 20s. net), of which the last part of the first volume was published eleven years ago, has just appeared. It presents the text of the First and Second Books of Samuel, and its editing has been in the very competent hands of A. E. Brooke, D.D., Norman McLean, M.A., and Henry St. John Thackeray, M.A., D.D., all of whom are acknowledged masters in the field of the Septuagint. In this edition the Vatican text is 'supplemented from other uncial manuscripts,' and provided 'with a critical apparatus containing the variants of the chief ancient authorities for the text of the Septuagint.' Fortunately the editors were able to avail themselves of MS. evidence placed at their disposal by the distinguished German Septuagint scholar, Professor Rahlfs. Recondite sources such as the Sahidic versions have been drawn upon, and even a series of Sahidic fragments containing extracts from a life of Samuel, but the salutary warning is added that inferences as to the text drawn from such a source which contains legendary additions have to be made with caution.

In his recent book on the 'Asatir,' Dr. Gaster has argued that, so far as the Hexateuch is concerned, Josephus in his 'Antiquities,' 'even if he did make use of a Greek translation of the Bible,' did not use the LXX which is now in our hands, but rather drew on some Palestinian Midrash. With this in the main Dr. St. John Thackeray agrees. But he maintains that though in that section Josephus was mainly dependent on a Semitic source, he becomes, from 158 onwards, 'a witness of first-rate importance for the text of the Greek Bible,' and the evidence afforded by him is accordingly carefully recorded in this volume.

In comparison with Swete's Septuagint, the textual variants here are bewilderingly abundant, occupying usually more than half the space of the text itself. Of Hebrew MSS Dr. Melville Scott has recently said, 'the painful drudgery involved in the collation of MSS is hardly needed; for this work has already been done, with vastly little result.' But whatever the result may be, we owe a deep debt of gratitude to scholars who are willing to make such a collation, even when much of the evidence is of no value, and may even be positively misleading, for purposes of interpretation; for

example, the famous verse 1 S 15^{13} reads θεραπείαν for *teraphim*, but it is good to know that the original meaning was still preserved in other MSS by θεραφειμ, etc. (cf. σεραφιμ), and more obscurely in 1 S 14^{41} by ὁσιότητα (even θειοτητα) for the unexpressed *thummim*. The extraordinary variety in the spelling of proper names is significant of many things: for example, in 2 S 21^{19} Goliath appears not only as Γωλιαθ, Γολιαθ, and Γολιαδ, but as Γοδολιαν (acc.), and even Γολοδιαν, while the Bethlehemite appears not only as ὁ Βαιθλεεμμειτης, but as νιου (בן) του ελεμι, and in 2 S 23^{8} an alternative to Ἰεβόσθε is the significant ιεσβααλ. If ever an approximately correct text of the Septuagint is to be reached, it will only be through the infinite toil and inexhaustible patience exhibited in such a volume as this.

THE SCOTTISH LAYMAN'S LIBRARY.

The Scottish Layman's Library goes on steadily increasing its number of issues. The two latest volumes are two of its best. One is *The Scottish Churches' Work Abroad*, by the Rev. J. H. Morrison, M.A., and the other, *Early Church Portraits*, by the Rev. J. Heston Willey, Ph.D., S.T.D. (T. & T. Clark; 5s. net each). Mr. Morrison is well known for his missionary writings, for his vivid style, his ample knowledge, his intellectual grasp. And all these qualities are apparent in his latest volume. He traces the Scottish missionary effort from its dawn to the present day, and in the course of his survey conveys an immense amount of information without losing himself or sacrificing the broad effects in the process. This is an excellent book, and all interested in missionary work, whether by Scotsmen or any others, should possess themselves of it.

We are impressed by the skill and felicity of the author of the other book, Dr. Willey. He begins with Polycarp, and gives us sketches of Tertullian, Origen, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Augustine, Gregory, Charlemagne, Peter the Hermit, and Dante. That is rich fare. It is Church history, and biography, and theology, and literature. And all these streams add their quota to the interest of the book. It is a book written with distinction, full of thought, and dealing with men and systems and influences about which we all wish to know something.

CONSTRUCTIVE CITIZENSHIP.

A new book by Principal Jacks, D.D., LL.D., D.Litt.—*Constructive Citizenship* (Hodder & Stoughton; 8s. 6d. net)—does not need review in the ordinary sense, it requires only mention; for Principal Jacks has his audience, and his audience knows what to expect. In the winter of 1926–27 he delivered in the University of Glasgow the Stevenson Lectures on Citizenship, and the book consists of those lectures with such additions as give greater completeness than the oral delivery of lectures permits. There are nineteen chapters dealing with such subjects as Constructiveness, Misleading Terms, Social Valour, the Hatefulness of Labour, Vitalized Leisure, Trusteeship, Rights and Duties, Co-operation, Social Tension. The very titles will suggest at once the interesting and valuable nature of the discussions.

Many topics suggest themselves for summary, but let us take a sentence or two from the chapter on Social Valour. 'The progress of civilization does not consist, as some would have it, in gradual advance to the point of safety, it consists much rather in a growing perception of the common risk and *the growing willingness to face it together*. I would urge you to beware of social doctrines and of religious doctrines, too, for there are such, which obscure the necessity of high courage, individual and collective. I would urge you to interpret the duties of your citizenship, primarily and essentially, as the duties of men and women who are called upon to make a valiant contribution to the work of their generation by taking their share in the dangers and sufferings of the common enterprise as well as in the fruits and the profits of it. Be prepared, I would say, for high demands on your courage, your resolution and your skill. Except as the valiant spirit inspires it, constructive citizenship is nothing at all. Let the training of the citizen, in all its stages, be conceived of accordingly.'

THE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

A really valuable book, which deserves the attention of all who are interested in the text of the Old Testament and desirous of recapturing, so far as that is now possible, the original text, has been written by the Rev. Melville Scott, D.D. He believes that he has made important *Textual Discoveries in Proverbs, Psalms, and Isaiah* (S.P.C.K.; 8s. 6d. net), and that the method by which he has reached them may be fruitfully pursued through the remaining books of the Old Testament.

Rightly dissatisfied with the cavalier methods of certain scholars who have practically re-written instead of emending the text, Dr. Scott believes

that there is a more excellent way, of which one of the essential conditions is that the suggested emendation be graphically probable. In other words, he never allows his suggestion to stray far from the actual letters of the traditional text, whose difficulties he believes have often been created by the accidental transposition of the letters of a word or more often still by confusion between letters, not only between the familiar ד and ר, or ב and כ, or ה and ח—this has long been recognized—but between such letters as מ and ם, ר and ו, כ and ס. He illustrates his thesis by numerous passages from Proverbs, Psalms, and Isaiah, offering emendations which, if not all equally probable, are always worth considering, and not infrequently convincing. Among the latter may be mentioned the reading לי לא for לולא in Ps 27^{13}, which for the '(I had fainted) unless . . .' of E.V. yields the sense 'he that uttereth violence *against me*: I believed *not* that I should see,' etc. So for the enigmatic 'sides of the north' in Ps 48^{2} Dr. Scott reads, 'Zion, *greatly treasured*,' for which use of צפון (ptc.) he compares Ezk 7^{22}; while in Pr 13^{23} the change of רַבּ into רִב yields '*a suit at law* devours the tillage of the poor.'

Some interesting quotations from an old book on the Psalter dated A.D. 1736 show that dissatisfaction both with the existing text and with the customary methods of improving it is not just a thing of yesterday, and Dr. Scott has little hope that further collation of MSS will yield results of any particular value. His own method and results have won the approval of no less distinguished a scholar than Professor Causse, who with Professors Jaeger and Ehrhardt recommended Dr. Scott on the strength of this book for the degree of Th.D. in the University of Strasbourg. The results of this same method of conjectural emendation are so interesting, and their potential value for a reconstructed text of the Old Testament so significant, that Dr. Scott is fully justified in expressing the modest hope that his work 'may receive a patient hearing from those best qualified to pass a verdict.'

RELATIVITY AND RELIGION.

The theory of Relativity is steadily making its influence felt in ever-widening realms of thought. This is inevitable if it be, as Weyl declares it to be, 'a cataclysm which has swept away space, time and matter hitherto regarded as the firmest pillars of natural science, but only to make place for a view of things of wider scope and entailing a deeper vision.' Wildon Carr has expressed his amazement at his fellow-philosophers for 'their short-sightedness in imagining that philosophy can be indifferent to this stupendous revolution in science.' It may be admitted that the theologians are in no better case. Any serious attempt to wipe away this reproach is to be commended. Accordingly we warmly welcome *Relativity and Religion*, by Mr. H. Douglas Anthony, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.A.S. (University of London Press; 6s. net). The writer would probably be the first to admit that his work was tentative. Two criticisms suggest themselves. In his exposition of the theory of Relativity use is made of mathematical symbols. All very well in their own place; but this is a book that deals with religion, and is presumably intended to be understood by the general reader. What enlightenment is there in telling us that the relation of past and future in two time-systems may be expressed in the form, $\omega_\mu(y_\mu - b_\mu) = \sum_\alpha l_{\mu\alpha}\omega_\alpha x_\alpha$? If, as Eddington predicts, 'a time will come when Einstein's amazing revelations will have sunk into the commonplaces of educated thought,' then mathematicians must learn to express these revelations in plain English. A second criticism is that in his exposition of the Christian faith (which is the only part of religion dealt with) the writer does not seem to go very far in tracing the bearings of Relativity. Certainly there is nothing here revolutionary. The position taken is simply that of modern liberalism.

These criticisms, however, need not be taken to mean more than that this is not a work of genius, for with so vast a field to survey and so overwhelming an inrush of new ideas, it would take a mind of the very highest order to systematize the whole and show its bearings in the remote regions of theology. This gigantic task awaits the efforts of many builders. Meantime let it be understood that Dr. Anthony's book is full of good things, and we owe him thanks for his gallant attempt.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

American educators in the religious sphere continue to work steadily at their great idea of a 'Project Principle.' This idea was explained recently in a special article in The Expository Times, and last month we had occasion to commend some books which give guidance in the application of the principle. This month there are several more on the same lines and from the same source. We cannot be too grateful for the contributions which the University of Chicago Press is making to the subject of religious education. It has just

issued four new volumes. One is by May K. Cowles and belongs to the *Problems in Living* series (3s. 9d. net). It is for junior classes, and deals with such topics as 'Living with a Purpose,' 'Playing Fair in Games,' 'The Necessity and Dignity of Work,' 'The Use of Sunday,' and so on. The other three volumes are by Dr. Erwin L. Shaver, who has done so much to make the Project method known. They are called *A Christian's Education*, *A Christian's Patriotism*, and *The Other Fellow's Religion* (2s. 6d. net each). The topics are such as inevitably arise in connexion with such great fields. Each one is introduced by a definite incident or 'life situation,' and from this incident the problem emerges and is discussed. That is the 'Project' way of teaching religion and ethics, beginning with a concrete case and shoving off into the deeper waters from this start. The method is so well devised and conducted that we would do well to learn from the Americans. These books are calculated to be of priceless value to Bible Class teachers and to ministers, and we earnestly counsel any teachers reading this notice to procure and weigh these admirable guides. They are published in this country by the Cambridge University Press.

Adventures in the Minds of Men, by Dr. Lynn Harold Hough (Abingdon Press; $1.50), is a collection of short articles, mainly on literary subjects, from various magazines. Some of them have a decided odour of the back number. Lloyd George is still Prime Minister, and Dr. Kelman is about to leave New York amid many regrets. It would perhaps be too much to say that the following sentence is typical: 'As I was leaving a certain office with a clergyman who has received the highest recognition in his own denomination, a well-known Englishman who wears his title without self-consciousness, looked whimsically at the two of us.' But there is more of this sort of thing than one cares to read. Yet the style throughout is bright and readable, and there are many literary judgments of value. The book concludes with some addresses on the equipment and work of the preacher, which are of more massive build and full of good things.

Messrs. Ernest Benn Ltd. are issuing a wonderful series of little books under the title 'Benn's Sixpenny Library.' A number of the issues have reached us out of the two hundred and fifty-two already published. Among these are, *Oliver Cromwell*, by Mr. Hilaire Belloc; *Catholicism*, by Father M. C. D'Arcy, S.J.; *Russian Literature*, by Mr. Janko Lavrin; *The Weather: An Introduction to Climatology*, by Mr. C. E. P. Brooks, D.Sc., and *The Life of Christ*, by the Rev. R. J. Campbell, D.D. All these booklets are done by real authorities, and are a wonderful achievement at the price. The last-named, *The Life of Christ*, by Dr. R. J. Campbell, is an admirable treatment of a great theme, and worth far more than the modest coin that will purchase it.

With almost incredible industry and rapidity, the indefatigable Canon Sell continues his good work of expounding the Bible and the historico-religious movement which it represents, in the light of the best scholarship and in simple language intelligible to everybody. The two latest volumes to hand are *A Guide to the Study of the Canon of the Old and New Testaments* (C.M.S. Publication Department, Salisbury Square, E.C.4; 1s. 3d.) and *The Samaritan and Other Jewish Sects* (1s. 6d.). It was a good idea to supplement the long series of Old Testament Commentaries with these useful volumes, which happily link up the Old Testament with the New. The book on the Canon crystallizes the discussions of Ryle and Westcott in their longer books, and tells in clear and vivid fashion all about the growth and origin of the two Canons that the ordinary Bible needs to know, besides incidentally suggesting bibliographical guidance for those who may desire to pursue the subject further.

The volume on 'The Sects' deals successively with the Samaritans, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, the Essenes, and the Zealots, and traces the history from the first Assyrian deportation in 734 B.C. to the Fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70. Excellent use is made of such New Testament passages as contain allusions to these sects. Both volumes should effectually dispose of the pathetic fallacy that Biblical history and literature are dull: Canon Sell makes us feel that the men and the movements he describes were very much alive. We are assured that these volumes, written in India and primarily for Indian pastors, have excited interest in places as far distant as North America and Australia. We do not wonder. There are no more lucid or inexpensive presentations of the results of Biblical scholarship in the market to-day. The whole series of Old Testament commentaries, crowned by these supplementary volumes, would make an admirable working library for teachers or preachers who have not time for more elaborate studies.

The Rev. Frank Ballard, M.A., D.D., B.Sc., is a prolific writer in the field of Christian Apologetics, and his latest book, *Twentieth-Century Christianity* (T. & T. Clark; 6s. net), is among the most useful of all his works. In it he gives brief sketches, 'manifestly only vignettes,' of the various sections of Christendom and their tenets. Of these some are represented as 'perversions' of the Christian ideal and the rest as 'approximations' to it, and the discussion of them occupies the first part of the book. In the second and larger part the author develops his own views of the Christian ideal in its application, under the heading 'The Christianity of the Future.' His standpoint, at once conservative and modern, is indicated in these words: 'Ideal Christianity is a life based upon the acceptance of the truth concerning Jesus Christ, His person, character, and teaching, His death and resurrection, with the practice of His spirit, as these are set forth in the New Testament, when it is fairly interpreted by itself, in modern lights.' It is further indicated in these other words, catching up the former: 'To say that Christianity is a life . . . implies that the essence of Christianity is an experience, not a mere mental attitude; an ideal of character, not an ecclesiastical system; rational service, not blind submission to tradition, or superstition, or convention; an offer of blessing, not a threat of condemnation; communion with a loving Father, not cowering before an angry Judge.' If a further characterization of standpoint be desired, it may be said to be Modernist as opposed to Fundamentalist. In this connexion one is reminded of a typical chapter in Dr. Ballard's book, that entitled 'Evolution,' in which with the aid of quotations from contemporary writers he expresses his sympathy with essential Darwinism. For the rest, the style is clear and popular, and the author touches upon many topics of current interest, ending with a series of negatives and positives in which he summarily states his conclusions in matters of Christian doctrine.

In a little book, *Divorce and the Roman Dogma of Nullity* (T. & T. Clark; 1s. 6d. net), Archdeacon Charles embodies a course of sermons which he preached in Westminster Abbey last July. He points out that the Reformed Churches, following Matthew for the most part, allow of divorce in the case of unchastity and also the re-marriage of the guiltless, whereas the Roman Church, deriving its views ultimately from Mark, forbids divorce altogether. It is, however, the particular contention of the present work that Mk 10^{2-12} is unhistorical, and that Matthew deliberately rejected it as unhistorical, and that thus the only foundation in the Gospels for the dogma of the indissolubility of marriage disappears, and with it the still more erroneous Roman dogma of Nullity. Needless to say, Dr. Charles sets forth his views at once clearly and learnedly; and his book is written with refreshing vigour.

Professor John B. Champion, M.A., of the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, offers a 'new and yet Scriptural' interpretation of the work of Christ in a volume of four hundred and fifty pages entitled *More Than Atonement* (Evangelical Press, Harrisburg, Pa.; $2.50). The book bears the somewhat pretentious sub-title 'A Study in Genetic Theology.' What is meant to be conveyed is that unless theology has its genesis at Calvary 'it gets nowhere.' The book also announces itself somewhat flamboyantly. But it is a solid enough study in the Scriptural teaching on Atonement and related themes, set forth with an abundance, indeed a superabundance, of illustrative and quotational matter. The standpoint is that of the traditional orthodoxy of the 'blood-theology.' Here is a fair sample of the style: 'Theology with Calvary as its birthplace always proves true to the primacy of Redemption. Theology born on the Arctic ice-cakes of naturalism is naturally cold to the Cross; but the theology born of the passion of Redemption and with the divine warmth of the blood of Christ pulsing through it can never freeze in the soul's veins.'

Four useful and informative lectures are comprised in Mr. W. G. Hanson's volume on *The Early Monastic Schools of Ireland* (Heffer; 3s. 6d. net), in which accounts are given of their missionaries, saints, and scholars. The author makes no pretension of being an expert in this obscure region of Church History, but he has been diligent in consulting authoritative writers, such as W. P. Ker and R. L. Poole. The first lecture shows how in the sixth century or earlier the whole of Ireland was practically turned into a University, in which the knowledge of Latin and Greek was conserved. The second lecture treats in particular of St. Columban, the greatest of the many scholar-monks of Ireland who passed over to the European Continent. The third treats briefly of the scholars of the eighth and ninth centuries, an age of 'epigons'; while the fourth is devoted to John Scotus Erigena, the one great thinker of the West in that dreary

epoch, who has been classed with Bishop Berkeley as one of the two men of religious genius whom Ireland has produced.

The Effects of the Reformation on Ideals of Life and Conduct, by the Rev. F. K. Chaplin, M.A. (Heffer; 5s. net), is the Hulsean Prize Essay for 1925. It is an exceedingly careful and scholarly piece of work, showing a well-balanced judgment and wide reading. An earnest attempt is made to trace the complex moral effects of the great liberating movement of the sixteenth century, a movement which swept along much mud and refuse in its impetuous course. The writer quotes Warneck (whom he repeatedly refers to as Warnack) in support of the statement that 'the view held by the Reformers was that systematic missionary activity was the duty of the Apostles alone.' This is hardly borne out by the evidence, for it was the dogmatists of a later time who developed the doctrine of the *Personale Privilegium*, though, as Warneck says, its germ may be found in Melanchthon. The Counter-Reformation is shown to have been, not merely a vigorous attack on Protestantism, but a real moral and religious revival within the Roman Church. The vitality and progress of that Church in modern times is fully acknowledged, but the grave charge is made that 'the maintenance of Papal supremacy involves, in the words of Bishop Gore, "a constant perversion of truth."' The general conclusion reached is that 'Rome is rendering, and is destined to render, notable services to mankind, but the restoration of its ancient supremacy in this country would be a grave spiritual disaster. The Roman version of Christianity is inadequate for modern needs. Its incapacity for reform disqualifies it for the spiritual leadership of free and civilized peoples.'

The Greatest Book in the World, by the late Rev. T. H. Darlow (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net), makes very fresh and interesting reading. Many histories of the Bible have been written, but this is something different. It is in the best sense a popular account of the development of Scripture and its influence upon civilization. Its vitality under modern criticism and its triumphs when brought into contact with all races are fully set forth and illustrated. The whole is admirably fitted to confirm faith in the Bible and to commend it afresh as the ever-living Word of God.

The modern preacher, whatever his faults, at least tries to be interesting. He knows that his first business is to capture the attention of his hearers. The Rev. Ernest Dowsett has shown in previous books that he has this gift, and in *The Man with the Plumb-Line* (Hunter & Longhurst; 2s. 6d. net) he has given a most readable 'series of addresses on the moral influence of Christ.' They are thoughtful, pictorial, and lit up with apt illustrations.

What makes a man a Congregationalist? The question is suggested by *A Hundred Eminent Congregationalists, 1530–1924*, by the Rev. Albert Peel, M.A., Litt.D. (Independent Press; 2s. 6d. net). The list includes Milton and Bunyan, on whom the Baptists have some claim—but then the Baptists are Congregationalists. It includes also Scots Presbyterians like Livingstone and James Chalmers, who served the London Missionary Society, which was regarded in Scotland and supported as practically an undenominational mission. Livingstone said that if he had been at home in 1843 he would have joined the Free Church. The biographies, necessarily very brief, are careful and accurate, as far as one can judge, and they will form a useful Congregationalist Who's Who.

Reprinted from the Journal of the Manchester Egyptian and Oriental Society is a suggestive little discussion by Israel W. Slotki on *Faded Letters in Ancient Texts*, who illustrates by an examination of Ezk 16^{4} 18^{10} and especially 21^{20} (E.V. 21^{15}) the thesis that our present Hebrew text has sometimes resulted from the incorporation of an explanatory marginal note into a text some of whose letters had become faded. On the original text of 21^{20} he conjectures 'That the heart may faint I set it against my people: it is a two-edged sword, yet a sword of supernatural panic' (חרב איש באחיו)—a conjecture which gets rid of the awkward word אבחת. Naturally such conjectures, however plausible, fall a long way short of certainty.

The Rev. W. Lockton, B.D., Vice-Principal of Winchester Diocesan Training College, is a diligent writer on the problem of the Four Gospels. His most recent work, *Certain Alleged Gospel Sources* (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net), is a booklet supplementary to his volume on 'The Three Traditions in the Gospels.' In it he offers a study of Q, Proto-Luke, and M. He submits some considerations which in his opinion tell against the existence of such documents as Proto-Luke and M (a Judaistic source of Matthew, according to Dr. Streeter), against the Mark-Q hypothesis generally, and, accordingly,

against the supposed priority of Mark. His positive conclusions are not generally accepted, but he is on the whole satisfied with them himself.

Professor Peake has done well to publish separately his discussion of *Elijah and Jezebel* (Longmans; 1s. 6d. net) which appeared first in the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. The stories of the Elijah cycle, while dealt with in Commentaries on 'Kings,' have seldom in English received the connected treatment which they here receive; and there could be no better initiation than this into the historical and religious problems which they involve. Dr. Peake argues that the Tyrian cult almost certainly must have received a set-back in the reign of Ahab, and that the implied rebuke of Elijah in 1 K 19^9 is directed not against the violence of his methods, but against his abandonment of his post, and against his error in thinking that Yahweh was more truly to be found at Horeb than in Palestine; a return to Moses was a retrograde step. This is a fine specimen of scientific discussion, which will be welcomed by all careful students of the Old Testament.

A most helpful book on the Lord's Supper has been written by the Rev. H. A. Wilson, Rector of Cheltenham, *At the Lord's Table* (Longmans; 1s. 6d.). There is a multitude of books of this kind, but few better than this. It deals in a thoroughly useful way with such matters as preparation for the service, and it explains the service itself fully and simply, besides providing suitable prayers and meditations for different parts of the service. No one with this book in his hands could fail to guide aright the youthful catechumen in his first steps as a communicant member of the Church.

Evidence intended to prove that the Caucasus Isthmus was the homeland of the Egyptians, Mesopotamians, Semites, Greeks, and Aryans is presented in *The Deluged Civilization of the Caucasus Isthmus*, by Reginald Aubrey Fessenden, Professor of Post-graduate Mathematics and Electrical Engineering in the University of Pittsburg. The first six chapters of this work were published in 1923. Chapter VII., on what the author calls 'The Location of the Pillars and Underground Record Chambers of the Cabeiri,' and Chapter VIII., on the homeland of Abraham, have not yet been published. Chapter IX., on the land of Gilgamesh and the Creation legends of Mesopotamia, appeared in the 'Christian Science Monitor,' 18th March 1924, and Chapter X., on the Greek homeland, in that paper, 8th March 1926. Chapter XI. has now been issued (Massachusetts Bible Society, Boston, U.S.A.; $2.00). This chapter contains a comparison of some of the Caucasian place-names with some of the more important and distinctive Egyptian and Aryan ones in the *Book of the Dead* or the *Vedas*. That the Caucasus tribes were at least the originators of Egyptian civilization is believed by many Egyptologists, partly on ethnological evidence and partly on proofs afforded by an examination of a large number of Egyptian skulls of mummies. The natural features of the Caucasus Isthmus seem to be identical with those referred to in the *Book of the Dead*, and Sir Flinders Petrie has shown that the Badarian type of pottery had travelled down from the Caucasus to Egypt. The author, in regarding the Isthmus as the homeland also of the Mesopotamians and Semites, will probably find many supporters. The region between the Black Sea and the Caspian certainly possessed at one time a civilization analogous to that of Elam and of Sumer, and there seems to be some evidence that its people, both by infiltration and invasion, took possession of these districts. On this theory, the author naturally places the Ur of Abraham, not in Southern Babylonia, but on the crest of the Caucasus, where the tribes were named Ach-ur. He is on surer ground when stating that the great nomadic tribes north of the Caucasus were the ancestors of the Aryan-speaking race. Neither ethnologists nor Biblical students will agree with all his statements, but the chapter just issued, like the others, shows a considerable amount of scholarship, as well as an intimate geographical knowledge of the Caucasus regions.

From Messrs. Marshall Brothers have come five volumes—*Life Radiant*, *Rainbows of the Soul*, *Eternal Realities of the Present Life*, *Look from the Top*, and *Come, ye Children*.

The *Life Radiant* contains studies of a helpful nature on the fully consecrated life. The author is the Rev. Canon F. J. Horsefield, D.D., and the price is 2s. 6d. net. The title is taken from the first chapter and from the words in Ps 34^5, the translation of which in the American Revised Version is 'They looked unto him and were radiant.'

Rainbows of the Soul is by the Rev. A. Douglas Adams, M.A., Vicar of Wimborne, St. John (5s. net). It is a volume of addresses embodying the old evangelical message, and the graciousness of the Master is in it.

A volume of earnest evangelical addresses with

the title *Eternal Realities of the Present Life* is by Louisa Clayton (3s. 6d net). There is a Foreword by the Rev. J. Russell Howden. 'Anything which sends us to our Bibles to search out for ourselves God's "exceeding great and precious promises" is to be welcomed. In this book God's servant has gathered together some "handfuls of meal" for His people. 'The reaffirmation to ourselves of God's gracious purposes for us cannot fail to strengthen our faith. At a time when the hearts of many are failing them for fear, may the message of this book be an inspiration and power to such.'

There are a number of illustrations. For example, on 2 Co 12^9 Prebendary Webb-Peploe's experience is quoted. 'He said that when he was staying at Saltburn-on-Sea in 1919 his baby died suddenly, and he had to carry the little body 400 miles back to his home in Herefordshire and the people on the crowded platforms rubbed against him and it hurt him very much. The next day was Sunday, and he chose for his text, "My grace is sufficient for thee." He began to write his sermon, and then he glanced at the same text on the wall of his study. His mother had worked it and given it to him some years before, and the little word "*is*" was picked out in yellow so as to give it prominence. After trying to write for two hours he laid down his pen and burst into tears and prayed, "*O God*, it is not true. I do not find it sufficient; please make it sufficient; do let it be clear to me."

'Then suddenly a voice seemed to say to him, "How can you ask God to make it sufficient when He says it is; how dare you doubt Him? Get up and believe what He says and you will find it true." Then the dark cloud passed away, and it never returned.'

Mrs. Ethel E. Chilvers is the author of Studies from 'The Song of Solomon' which she originally delivered at Bethesda Baptist Chapel, Ipswich, and at Spurgeon's Tabernacle, London. The title is *Look from the Top* (6s. net). The 'Song' is dealt with 'throughout from the standpoint of its spiritual application to the life of the present-day believer, rather than as an interpretation of its historical and dispensational setting.'

Come, ye Children is thirty-two short addresses to boys and girls, several dealing with subjects such as death and immortality, which this teacher, the Rev. William McNeill, knows are difficult of approach (2s. 6d. net).

Science and Faith, by Mr. W. G. Radley, B.Sc. (Morgan & Scott; 1s. net), is a little book which may be read with profit even by those who have no knowledge of modern science. It is written in an interesting and popular style by one who combines a knowledge of science with a firm Christian faith. 'The God whom our forefathers pictured as dwelling in His heaven very close above the blue, has become the God whose realm extends into distances which almost appal the imagination. But He is just the same God. Our outlook has changed, but He has not changed. He is still the One who came to seek and to save that which was lost—mankind.'

The President of the Moody Bible Institute, the Rev. James M. Gray, D.D., would doubtless call himself a Fundamentalist. At any rate, in *My Faith in Jesus Christ* (Oliphants; 6s. net) he follows their style of argumentation. It is all very logical and convincing to those who accept his premises, but to other minds it will not carry conviction. The writer is earnestly contending for the faith, but one could wish that there were some recognition of the fact that others may find their way to that same faith by a different route.

A book of considerable interest, and (its author believes) of real importance, is *Eden and After*, by Mr. J. Gibson Smith (Otago Daily Times, Dunedin, New Zealand; 2s. 8d.). Though it is a book of verse, it is really a theological work. And its main thesis is that the inferior man-like creatures, discovered by science and called men, were not men at all but animals, and that the soul is a purely novel creation. He would repudiate Professor Arthur Thomson's doctrine, expounded in his Gifford Lectures, that the highest in man was implicit all the time from the lowest form of life. The novel thing in Mr. Smith's book is that, while thus repudiating an ape-like ancestry for man, he is willing to accept all the real discoveries of Darwinism and is indeed a believer in evolution. The acceptance of the scientific theory that our simian ancestors were really *men* is, he thinks, a nightmare due to diabolic agency. All this is expounded in a long introduction. Then follow the poems in which his doctrine is sung. And very well sung too. We have no hesitation in saying that the book is worth considering.

Two books on Immortality have just appeared. The subject seems perennially attractive to writers and readers alike. For we hardly issue a number of this magazine without at least one notice of a book on the subject. One of the two referred to is *Life, Death and After*, by the Rev. F. G. Goddard,

M.A., B.D., the Vicar of Jesmond (Scott ; 2s. 6d. net). It is on traditional lines for the most part. But it strikes a definite note, and one that will be welcome to many readers, when it contends not only that we shall know one another in the other world, but also that we may pray for the dead as they do for us. Every subject (like Survival, the Intermediate State, Is there a Second Chance ? and Spiritualism) is discussed with ability, common sense, and persuasiveness. The book can be cordially commended to all specially in need of comfort and to those in need of light and faith.

The other book is *Immortality*, by Mr. I. Harris, M.D. (Williams & Norgate ; 2s. 6d. net). Frankly, it is a little difficult to make out what Dr. Harris believes on the point. His general contention seems to be that man is simply an expression and embodiment of the great forces of the universe, that he is without real freedom, and that his immortality is of a somewhat vague nature. 'Man and the work of man remain forever indestructible. Man and his doings are as enduring as the whole universe. Nothing can be changed. Every deed, all occurrences become a part of cosmic existence, as enduring as the universe.' And 'death is merely a conclusion of individual activity.' Cold comfort. But the book is able and interesting.

Messrs. Skeffington & Son have issued three books of excellent religious reading. The first is a volume of *Sermons for Matins*, i., edited by the Rev. J. H. Burn, B.D. (6s. net). It covers the period from Advent to Trinity Sunday. Eleven of the sermons are by Dr. Alfred Plummer, and in general the list of preachers is a strong one. The tone of the sermons is expository and devotional.

Life's Silver Lining, by the Rev. Tickner Edwardes (5s. net), is defined in the sub-title as 'Thoughts about Christ's Religion for those who find the World Dark.' It contains no fewer than one hundred and eighty-seven brief meditations on Scripture texts, all of a strengthening and helpful kind. The writer believes that 'God does not remove the mountains of trouble from our path—why should He, seeing that He has put them there, or wisely suffers them to be there, for our good ? But He does, by right of our willing claim to be His faithful servants, place in our hands the "new sharp threshing instrument" by which we can beat them small for ourselves.'

Heaven, by the Rev. Septimus Hebert, M.A. (2s. 6d. net), is an exposition of some of the religious ideas underlying the symbolism of 'St. John's last vision in Revelation xxi.–xxii.' The writer is not interested in controversy or in questions of criticism. 'There is no religious controversy in this book. It is neither High Church, nor Low Church, nor Broad Church. It might be read as well by the Roman Catholic as by the Salvation Army captain.' And, it may be added, they will all find in it much that is sane and Christian.

The World-Wide Call, by the Rev. H. P. Thompson, M.A. (S.C.M. ; 4s. net), is a popular presentation of the situation underlying the recent World Call Reports. It contains a series of swift and vivid pictures of present-day movements in Japan, China, India, Africa, and the Muslim world, especially as they affect the propagation of the gospel. Another chapter, perhaps the most striking of all, is given to our own people overseas, in which is presented a wonderful panorama of the world-wide activities of the British race. The whole survey gives point to a stirring missionary appeal. 'The missionary duty is rooted in the very nature of God, and is always binding on every Christian. But there come times when in a special degree the way seems prepared for a wider advance of God's Kingdom, and the call seems to come with special clearness to His Church. To-day is such a time.'

The British Connection with India, by Mr. K. T. Paul (5s. net), is a volume issued by the Student Christian Movement with the object of informing public opinion in this country about the efforts of the natives of India to secure a greater measure of what may be called Home Rule. There is a wholly sympathetic introduction to the volume by the Earl of Ronaldshay, formerly Governor of Bengal. Mr. Paul has arranged the contents with skill. He disclaims being the mouthpiece of any organization with which he is connected ; he writes his own personal views. Now that the Government has appointed a Statutory Commission to inquire into, and report to the Imperial Parliament on, the very big question of the future government of our great Dependency, it is an advantage that we at home, who really are ill-informed about intelligent native opinion as represented, for example, in the Indian National Congress, should learn from so capable an authority as Mr. Paul.

The Cambridge University Press, despite the efforts of 'Big Bill Thompson,' maintains its high reputation for the production of books of sound scholarship. Having completed a monumental work in its translation of the Old and New Testaments, it has issued in handy form *The Student's*

Gospels (English publishers, Cambridge University Press; 5s. net), edited by Dr. Shailer Mathews and Dr. Edgar J. Goodspeed. It contains a harmony of the Synoptic Gospels in parallel columns, with the Gospel of John appended, all rendered according to the excellent American translation of Dr. Goodspeed. This makes a very convenient pocket edition.

Messrs. Watts & Co. are issuing a series of small books at sevenpence each under the title of 'The Forum' Series. Two of these include Professor Sir Arthur Keith's Presidential Address to the British Association in August last—*Concerning Man's Origin*, and *The Earth, Its Nature and History*, by Mr. Edward Greenly, D.Sc. These are both scientific, but also popular and authoritative, and well worth having.

The sixth *Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research* (Yale University Press, New Haven) contains not a few things of interest to others than scholars. A brief sketch of the history of the American School of Oriental Research in Jerusalem founded in 1900, and that of Baghdad, opened in 1923, is followed by a fascinating essay by W. F. Albright on 'The Jordan Valley in the Bronze Age,' in the course of which the writer, dealing with the Dead Sea, says, 'it seems perfectly rational to assume the correctness of the traditional view that the Cities of the Plain are now buried under the waters of the Dead Sea.' As against most recent criticism, he further defends the substantial historicity of Gn 14, which he regards as based upon an old poetic saga or epic. This illustrates the growing tendency to lay more stress upon tradition than till lately criticism has been inclined to do. Another essay deals with the private archives of a prominent family, composed in a dialect of Accadian, which throw much curious light on the social conditions of the time, and in parts vividly illustrate the Old Testament. W. H. P. Hatch offers a description, with illustrations, of a visit to the Coptic convents of Nitria, a desolate valley in the Libyan Desert. He is of opinion that the ancient blood of Egypt is far better preserved in 'these people'—the Copts—'than is ancient Greece or Rome in the modern Greeks or Italians.' The volume gives us a fine insight into the varied and valuable work of Oriental research, as conducted by Americans.

Our Lord's Teaching on the Kingdom of Heaven.

By the Reverend W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D., Ilford.

It is quite unprofitable to argue whether the Fatherhood of God or the Kingdom of God occupied the principal place in the teaching of our Lord. For whichever of these two great themes is regarded as predominant, the fact remains that tremendous stress is laid by our Lord upon the other. Our concern is with His instructions on the Kingdom of God. That this subject held a conspicuous and habitual place in His teaching is beyond dispute.

It may be said with certainty that the phrase which our Lord employed was Kingdom of Heaven, rather than Kingdom of God. For the habitual custom of the Jewish people was to substitute other expressions for the Holy Name. The Book of Daniel furnishes illustrations of this use, when it speaks of the Highest and the King of Heaven. Similarly, in the New Testament, the High Priest calls God 'the Blessed,' and the Prodigal Son speaks of having 'sinned against Heaven.' Our Lord would almost certainly follow the Jewish use. Indeed, it is significant that the most Jewish Gospel adopts the phrase the 'Kingdom of Heaven,' whereas the phrase 'Kingdom of God' is adopted in writings designed for the Gentile world, where, as H. J. Holtzmann observes, the latter phrase would be more intelligible. It is clear, therefore, that the two are synonymous.

The phrase 'Kingdom of Heaven' was already in common use and had a history before our Lord adopted it. It is therefore indispensable to know what meaning it possessed for the Jewish people. It is all the more essential to know this because the term is nowhere expressly defined by our Lord in His teaching. The idea is evidently regarded as one quite familiar to all His hearers. What, then, was the conception which the term represented to our Lord's contemporaries? There is

little doubt about the answer. Schürer, in his *History of the Jewish People*, shows that the Kingdom of Heaven represented for Jewish thought a Divine Society, a sphere over which Jehovah was Lord and King, partly political but essentially religious, an external association on earth within which the will of God is fulfilled. This Kingdom of Heaven was to be visible within the world. It would have its headquarters at Jerusalem. It was the Kingdom of the Messiah. Over it the Messiah would preside. Deliverance would be secured to Israel, which would be supreme among the nations. Of course, the qualities of this conception varied with the religious insight and spiritual depth of the individual mind. But, broadly speaking, these were the general ideas associated with the Kingdom. What emerges beyond question is that the conception was essentially and profoundly institutional.

That, indeed, is natural, almost inevitable. For all ancient religion is essentially corporate. The individual acquired his value as a member within the community. And further, it is clear the Kingdom of Heaven in the Jewish view 'was not regarded as a human achievement, either individual or social, but as an institution erected by the sovereign act of God' (Cooley, *The Aim of Jesus Christ*). The Kingdom was from Heaven, but upon earth. Not a Kingdom in Heaven and so to be entered only after death. Still less was it regarded merely as a state of mind or inner condition of religious peace (*ibid.* 52, 53).

We may be absolutely certain that when our Lord adopted the phrase 'Kingdom of Heaven' He transfigured it, as He did all other great historic religious terms, filling them all with immeasurably deeper meaning. 'Nihil tetigit quod non ornavit.' But while He glorified all religious phrases, He did not contradict their essential value. And unless He intended by the phrase 'Kingdom of Heaven' to convey an institutional idea, His use of it could only have been for His contemporaries hopelessly misleading.

The fact is that Institutionalism was the essential character of the Religion of Israel in which our Lord grew up. And there is no sign that He ever rejected this principle. On the contrary, He claimed that He had come 'not to destroy, but to fulfil.' That claim must not be minimized. Our Lord's attitude toward the Institution of Israel was never revolutionary or destructive. He seems to regard the Kingdom, whatever contents that term involves, as the natural consummation of Israel's development, provided always that Israel is prepared to accomplish its divinely intended mission. Indeed, if the hierarchy of Israel had accepted Jesus as the Messiah, it is quite conceivable that the Institutionalism of Israel would have assumed a Christian form, and that no separation between Judaism and Christianity need have happened.

While our Lord's conception of the Kingdom of Heaven is nowhere defined, it is richly illustrated in the Parables. These illustrations are at first bewildering by their variety. But a number of recent foreign theologians, such as H. J. Holtzmann and Feine, have shown that the Parables unmistakably emphasize certain leading characteristics of the Kingdom.

There are parables which regard the Kingdom as a personal and individual possession. It is a treasure which a man must acquire. It is an inward state. There are other parables which regard the same Kingdom as a social and corporate institution. It is compared to a net which gathers of every kind.

These two aspects of the Kingdom must be united. Neither can be excluded from our Lord's teaching. The Kingdom is individual, in separate hearts and lives. But it is also collective and institutional. The Parable of the Treasure emphasizes the personal side of religion. The Parable of the Net as unmistakably emphasizes the social. The Kingdom of Heaven, in our Lord's conception of it, cannot be adequately represented by calling it the reign of God. It is indeed God's reign. But it is a reign over human beings; and over human beings not contemplated in pure isolation, but as associated within a corporate institution.

A third characteristic of the Kingdom appears in the parables. It is future and yet it is present, *i.e.* 'The kingdom of God is at hand' (Mt 4^{17}), 'The kingdom of God is come upon you' (Mt 12^{28}). It develops and matures. It is in its beginnings insignificant, but grows to completion. It exists here on earth in a mixed, imperfect state. For it includes the worthy and the worthless. It will exist hereafter in a perfect condition by the exclusion of the unworthy. But it was here in our Lord's time, and some who were then living would see it come with power (Mk 9^{1}). It is placed in the Lord's Prayer to be perpetually before the minds of His people.

One further characteristic of the Kingdom is that it is essentially Messianic. It is the Kingdom over which the Messiah presides. Accordingly, where Christ and His disciples were assembled, there in principle the Kingdom was already realized.

It is supremely important that the Messianic character of the Kingdom of Heaven should be carefully borne in mind. Christ's teaching about the Kingdom cannot be otherwise understood.

To our Lord's teaching about the Kingdom must be added His teaching about the Church.

The doubts which certain critics have suggested whether our Lord could ever have spoken about the Church are felt by various leading scholars to be destitute of any solid proof. Batiffol's reply in *L'Église Naissante* has fairly set those doubts aside. The term 'the Church' was already familiar in the Greek translation of the Old Testament, and no conclusive reason can be given why our Lord should not have spoken some Aramaic equivalent to the word.

More serious is the doubt which some have felt whether our Lord, who is thought, from the discourses in St. Matthew, to have expected the speedy end of the world, could have had any intention to found the Church. This difficulty is real. But it depends upon the exposition of the eschatological discourses, which is itself a problem, and by no means solved. Beside those discourses must be set the passages where our Lord undoubtedly speaks as if the end of human history was distant. For example, in Mt 24, 'Many shall come in my name, saying, I am the Christ; and shall lead many astray. And ye shall hear of wars and rumours of wars: see that ye be not troubled: for these things must needs come to pass; but the end is not yet' (vv.[5. 6]). This passage distinctly suggests a considerable period during which a series of events would happen. See further vv.[7-13]. The same passage further declares, 'this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations; and then shall the end come' (v.[14]). What makes these statements all the more significant is that they come from the same Gospel which reports the eschatological discourses, and, in fact, form an introduction to them; cf. further Mt 10[18], where our Lord predicts that the disciples will be brought before governors and kings for His sake, for a testimony to them and to the Gentiles. That again suggests an extended and world-wide mission. Again, when our Lord warns Israel that the Kingdom of God would be taken away from them and given to another people (Mt 21[43]), the idea implied is certainly very different from the immediate end of the world. Moreover, the Parable of the Tares affirms that the separation of evil from good is postponed: 'Let both grow together until the harvest.'

St. Matthew then reports our Lord's intention to build His Church. It is a community of men. Authority in it will be exercised by a man. It will exist on earth, and its official actions will be endorsed in Heaven. It is ensured perpetuity.

The relation between the Church and the Kingdom of Heaven is suggested by the very remarkable fact that our Lord combines the mention of the two in one sentence. He will found His Church: He will give to an official in it the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. The keys of the Kingdom will be employed within the Church. What else than the very intimate connexion of the Church with the Kingdom can be thereby intended? As Loisy says, 'Christ proclaimed the Kingdom, and what appeared was the Church.' Do not the two appear as interchangeable?

Significant also is the fact that whereas our Lord, with only two exceptions, invariably speaks of the Kingdom and not of the Church, St. Paul almost reverses this use of terms. He speaks of the Church four times as often as he does of the Kingdom. Is not the reason plain? The Kingdom of Heaven is a Jewish expression and less intelligible to the Gentile world. The Church became the habitual designation for the reality which our Lord proclaimed.

If, with this teaching of our Lord in view, we study the principal actions of His ministry, the whole Gospel proves that He was engaged in the training of the Twelve, with the result that He formed a community. The Twelve were not only united to Himself, but also to one another. They formed a Body which, with the teaching He had given them, was what our Lord at His Ascension bequeathed to the world. Out of the training and instruction of this group arose the Church. He could look on that insignificant Galilean group and say, 'Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.' The Jerusalem community contained three elements of doctrine, ministry, and sacrament. And all these through the action of our Lord. What Christ did throws light on what Christ taught.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

His Master's Voice.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

'I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.'—Ph 4^{13}.

That title at once makes us think of the clever picture we have seen on a hundred gramophone records: a dog hearing his master's voice, recognizing it, and looking down the trumpet to see where it is coming from. It is not about that I wish to talk, but it is a dog story I want to tell you. I think all girls and boys are fond of dogs, and every one likes a good dog story. Some of the best stories in the world are about dogs.

There is the story of Ulysses: how he came home after all his adventures so changed that nobody knew him, not even his wife, save only two—his old nurse who knew him by a scar on his knee, and his dog who knew him by that strange instinct which makes a dog such a faithful friend of man.

There is the story of Llewellyn's dog, Gelert, who killed the wolf and saved the baby, and was killed by his hasty master. It happened long ago, but still in North Wales there is a place called Beddgelert, where people go to see Gelert's grave—a dog's grave.

Scotland gives us the story of Greyfriars Bobby, the little Scotch terrier who lay every night for years on his master's grave, couldn't be driven away, and at last died there. The children in the shabby houses that overlooked the graveyard cleaned their dirty windows because they wanted to see 'Bobby,' and their homes were more full of light, and perhaps their hearts were more full of love, because a little dog was faithful to his dead master. When he died, a drinking-fountain was set up with his statue on it, and all the city did honour to the loving faithfulness of 'Wee Bobby,' and to-day 'Bobby' is the favourite name for Scotch terriers.

Well, it was just such another little Scotch terrier in a city street. He had rambled and raced out of his master's sight, and his master, missing him, went to look for him. At last he saw him being hounded and pelted down the road by a lot of noisy children. He was desperately frightened, his tail was down, and he looked wildly here and there for a way of escape. What could he do against these boys? How big they were! How loud their voices! So he was running and running hard.

Then he heard a voice call, 'Jock!' He stopped and pricked up his ears. It was his master's voice! He couldn't see him yet, but he knew he was there and would stand by him. He was not friendless or forgotten. Up came his tail half-way and wagged like a semaphore, as much as to say 'Message received.'

Then up went his tail like a standard of battle. He didn't whine now, but gave one joyous yelp and turned on his tormentors, barking furiously. He ran now, not from them, but at them. Now it was they who ran, for boys that would pelt a little dog are great cowards. He chased them down the street in headlong rout and then came back to his master, his tail waving like a flag of triumph, barking exultantly as if to say, 'We've done it! They were too much for *me*, but they couldn't stand up against *us*.' Such heart did the sound of his master's voice put into a little dog and made him more than conqueror through one that loved him.

Girls and boys, we, too, have a Master who loves us and can make us more than conquerors. He never leaves us, but we often leave Him and then we get into difficulties and think we are alone and forgotten. But He cannot forget. He is watching. Do you remember the disciples in the storm? It was dark. The wind was contrary. They weren't making any headway, and worst of all, 'Jesus was not come to them.' They were afraid and losing courage. Then He came. They heard His voice. They 'willingly received him into the ship and very quickly the ship was at the land that they were going to.' I think that just means that His voice put heart and strength into them and they mastered the waves and won to the shore.

'I can do all things,' says St. Paul, 'through Christ which strengtheneth me.' Long ago in Scotland, when the people were fighting a sore and desperate battle against the power of the Church of Rome, they said about John Knox that his voice 'is able in one hour to put more life in us than five hundred trumpets continually blustering at once in our ears.'

So the voice of Jesus has brought cowed spirits to their feet again, and made faint hearts brave to win back lost battles. In the ship in the storm

when every one was afraid, how was it that St. Paul, not a soldier, nor a sailor, but just a man who till then had been frightened like every one else, could suddenly stand up and bid them all 'be of good cheer'? Read on, and you will find out. It was because he had heard the voice of Jesus saying, 'Fear not, Paul.'

Stand up! stand up for Jesus!
The trumpet-call obey.

The voice of Jesus is the trumpet-call. It never sounds for retreat, but always for victory.

The Lutine Bell.

By the Reverend T. Crouther Gordon, D.F.C., B.D., Pitlochry.

'There is joy in the presence of the angels of God.'—Lk 15^{10}.

Do you know what 'A1' means? If you hear your Daddy refer to a new pair of boots, he will say 'They are A1.' Now you know what he means by that—they are very good. They are first-class. There is nothing better. 'A1' means the front rank.

But where does 'A1' come from? I will tell you. There is a big office in London called Lloyds, where the name of every ship has to be written in a big book, and against every ship they put a letter, which shows whether it is a good ship or a bad ship, and when they put 'A1' against a ship it means that is the best kind of ship afloat. It is registered 'A1' at Lloyds.

Now supposing you and I were to go walking through this big office in London, we should come to a very important room, where there are a great many men walking about, doing business. And in that room we should see a bell hung up. If we looked close at the bell, we would see the name 'Lutine' inscribed on it. This bell belonged to a ship called the *Lutine*, which was shipwrecked sixty years ago. But it was a valuable ship. It was full of gold. The gold was not in sovereigns and half-sovereigns, but in chunks. It was rough and heavy. So valuable was this cargo that they sent down divers, who brought the gold up and with the gold they brought the bell, and this is how the bell was saved.

But, you ask, what good is a bell in a big office in London? It serves a great purpose, for the people ring the bell at certain times. When all the men are walking about and talking business, suddenly this bell will be rung, and the whole place will be dead still. Everybody stops talking. For when that bell rings, it means that a ship is lost. Away out on the sea, where the waves are mountains high, some ship is going down. Or perhaps away in the fog and mist some ship has lost her way. And all the people stand still and silent when the bell rings.

You and I, boys and girls, are all little ships. We are sailing across the ocean of life. There are storms to face. There are fogs and mists to meet. We are carrying with us very rich cargo. It is far richer than gold or silver. It is called character. And there is a place where people are standing still and silent when we are lost. It is called heaven. Jesus told us that there is joy in the presence of the angels when we turn to God and are saved, and so there must be sorrow when we are lost. When we give in to some mean desire, when we tell a deliberate lie, because we hate somebody, when we play truant at school, these are the times when we are striking the rocks and our little boat is lost. Then the bell rings in heaven, and Jesus looks down, with all our friends in heaven, and He is very sad and sorrowful. It hurts Him to think that we are going down.

Into the night, forlornly bright
There came a little ship of gold,
Without a name, she passed in flame,
With cargoes never to be told,
Out of a port unknown,
Swinging to death alone.

But the work of the bell is not finished. Bells are made for joy as well as sorrow. Nothing is so sweet as the marriage bell. And when this Lutine Bell is struck the second time, all the men in the big office are delighted and glad. They smile to each other. Sometimes they shake each other by the hand. There is joy everywhere, because when the bell is struck the second time it means that the vessel is reported safe and sound. It means that a boat that had been given up for lost has returned to port again.

And, we are told, it is just the same in heaven. When we give up our wrong ways, and guide our little ship of gold back to the right path, when we are very sorry for all the wrong that we have done, when we say that we will do better in the future, then the bells of heaven are ringing and there is joy in the presence of the angels.

But do you know that the bell in heaven has got an echo? The echo reaches all the road to us. Have you never heard it? What a pity! A little boy I know was walking along the street one day in a big city, when he saw a blind man

standing on the pavement. The blind man wanted to cross the street, but he was afraid of the traffic. So the little boy rushed forward and, grasping him by the hand, took him to the other side, and when he went home that day the little boy heard the echo of the bells of heaven in his heart.

The Christian Year.

SEXAGESIMA.

The Crowning Quality.

'He that shall endure unto the end, the same shall be saved.'—Mk 13^{13}.

1. *Life's increasing test.*—The greatest and most enviable form of power in human experience is staying-power. Life seems peculiarly designed for the discovery in us of such staying-power, for most lives grow harder and harder as the years multiply. There is a sense in which the experience of Jesus is the epitome of that of all mankind. The tragic last phase, with its unspeakable agony in the Garden and upon the Cross, was but the final unfolding of the meaning of the first temptations and of the repeated tests of His loyalty to God and man which studded the path of His life. And perhaps of all the wonderful things He ever said none was more welcome to Himself than His cry of victory from the Cross, 'It is finished.' Most lives tend towards the same type of experience. Perhaps there are exceptions—lives that begin in storm and stress and seem to ride for the rest of their days in a calm and pleasant roadstead. Yet even of these one suspects that in their success and in their serenity there may be a more subtle test of their spiritual condition than they suspect; and one that is the harder, therefore, to meet and satisfy. But for most of us the fight gets harder; life becomes more complicated, not less, as the number and responsibility of its relationships increase. As the powers of the body move forward to maturity, revealing the full strength of animal passion that is in the best of men, and as they just as steadily begin to wane, bringing the further complication of failing health, life often becomes a pitiful struggle.

2. *Continuity essential.*—We come face to face, therefore, with the necessity of continuity if the soul is to be saved. The standing of the last test, of the worst and the fiercest test, is essential. Not upon good beginnings, nor even upon steady continuings, but only upon solid endings can God place the seal of success. What avails it that we turned to God in our youth and held on to Him through years of severe struggle if now we are going to give way? It is not what we *were*, but what we *are* that makes us safe. Could there be any greater condemnation, any more shameful condition for a soul that has once seen the vision, once felt the fire of God within him, than to qualify for that caustic description of Scripture: 'Ephraim is a cake half-turned'? This is a warning that our age needs peculiarly. We live in such a hurry that we worship swiftness rather than strength. As a writer has said:

The fault of the age is a mad endeavour
To leap to heights that were made to climb,
By a burst of strength, by a trick most clever
We plan to forestall and outstrip time.

Yet to covet the prize and shrink from the winning,
To thirst for glory yet fear to fight,
What can it lead to at last but sinning,
To mental languor and moral blight?

What can God Himself do for the soul that wants only the end, but not the endurance? As Ibsen says, through his great character, Brand, concerning the peasant and his son who would not face the storm with him:

Were it but the power you lack
I would have borne you on my back.
My weary back, my feet that bleed,
Had gladly answered to your need;
But help is useless to a man
Who does not *will*, save where he can.

3. *The way of victory.*—Yet, providing we are willing to endure, however much we doubt our strength, there are considerations of great inspiration that can be brought to our aid. In the first place, the increasing test of life is not wanton, it has its purpose. It is everything to feel that the test is not opposition but opportunity. Readers of Hugh Walpole's great novel *Fortitude* will remember the motto that its hero Peter learned to cherish early in life, 'It is not life that matters, but the courage you bring to it,' and they will recall how at one point in his troubled career the true interpretation of all his tribulation was brought home to his soul. 'You are worth it, you are too valuable to be left in peace,' was the message that came to him.

But a further consideration of overwhelming importance is that the power which can come only by the practice of endurance is the very substance of salvation. 'In your patience,' said Jesus, 'ye shall win your soul.' Here is the very

soul of life's meaning, to receive for one's own possession the character that is divine. As a great poet has so beautifully declared:

Endurance is the crowning quality
And patience all the passion of great hearts:
These are their stay, and when the leaden world
Sets its hard face against their fateful thought,
And brute strength, like a scornful conqueror,
Clangs his huge mace down in the other scale;
The inspired soul but flings his patience in,
And slowly that outweighs the ponderous globe,
One faith against a whole earth's unbelief,
One soul against 'the flesh of all mankind.'[1]

QUINQUAGESIMA.

The Cup Jesus would not drink.

'They gave him vinegar to drink mingled with gall: and when he had tasted thereof, he would not drink.'—Mt 27^{34}.

This draught of vinegar mingled with gall, or, as Mark more accurately expresses it, 'wine mingled with myrrh,' must be distinguished from the sponge filled with vinegar and put upon a reed in the last hour in which Jesus hung upon the Cross. This draught was offered to Him as He stood by the Cross before He was nailed to it. The spongeful of vinegar was given in response to His cry: 'I thirst.' The draught was a cup of spiced wine. It contained a drug intended to stupefy. It was the rude chloroform of the day. The other was only a sop to cool the burning fever of His tongue.

There was in Jerusalem a society of benevolent women whom gentle pity moved to a gracious ministry to the outcast and the criminal. It was their custom to provide this draught of wine mingled with myrrh that the felon on his cross might have the agony and horror of his crucifixion dulled and his senses deadened, while death was making the slow conquest of his life. The cup filled with this spiced and stupefying wine was set down at the foot of the Cross. It was placed in the hands of Jesus.

Why would not Jesus drink of this cup? He did not usually disregard any gracious service done to Him. When He sat by the well of Samaria, He eagerly sought and gratefully accepted the water from the woman's hand. When hunger pressed Him, He went in with simple gratitude to meat. In the garden of Gethsemane He earnestly entreated the companionship and the solace of men. Nay, when He found Himself fainting under the weight of His Cross, He willingly allowed it to be placed on the shoulders of Simon of Cyrene. But now, when He is spent with hours of fasting, when He is face to face with the agony of the Cross, He refuses the cup offered to Him by kindly hands. *Why?* Because He will not have His senses drugged. He will not have His mind clouded. He will not suffer any unspiritual aid to be given to His resolve. He will be fully master of Himself. He will go through the valley of the shadow of death with every sensibility in keen tension, with every faculty in unclouded clearness, with body, soul, and spirit poured out in the act of dying before God.

1. Mark the *light this incident casts on the purpose of Jesus' death.* The purpose of Christ's death is a subject of vexing contention for Christian thinkers. Its depths remain unfathomed for many devout souls. Its uses and issues are perplexities for many who love His name. The most unthinking reader, however, can see that it occupied the place of supreme importance to Christ. It was the event towards which He looked; the goal towards which He strained; the hour for whose coming He waited. As often as the prevision of the Cross came in upon Him, His soul was troubled, and in this closing day of His life, His thoughts and desires turn towards it, as the thought of a lover to his beloved, or the desires of a runner to his goal. His very face shines with the foregleams of mingled suffering and triumph when He sets His face steadfastly to go to Jerusalem for His dying hour.

If it was the burden of Christ's heart before it was accomplished, it was the chant of the disciples after Calvary was past. No other subject so possesses, inspires, exalts these apostolic men. One of the wonderful things about the Epistles is their scanty reference to Christ's life and words. We are eager to dwell on that life of loveliness and grace. But Paul and Peter and James and John have their hearts more set on the risen Christ, and His coming again.

Why has the death of Jesus this place of pre-eminence? Surely not because it was the final and dramatic seal to a life of righteousness. Surely not because we may thereby be touched and emotionalized into a strenuous morality. Surely not because of its pathos and sorrow, that we might love Him for the dangers He has passed with the love pity deigns to bestow. No; the death of Christ was His supreme work—the work He desired with anguish to accomplish; the work for which He took our flesh and veiled His Godhead.

[1] A. D. Belden, *The Religious Difficulties of Youth*, 144.

In that dying act He assumed our sins, He bore our guilt, He suffered our penalty, He offered Himself our sacrifice. As He stands beside the Cross, He is laying Himself down on the altar of God, and He will do His great deed in the full might of a willing, conscious, unclouded sacrifice. He will not lay down His life with a torpid body, half-dead sensibilities, a dulled mind, a clouded spirit. He will do this great deed, as it required to be done, in full self-consciousness, and thereby make a perfect sacrifice.

2. Mark the *light this incident casts on the value of Jesus' dying hour.* Let us conceive that Jesus had yielded to this temptation, that, face to face with the agony of the Cross, He had drained the cup, and so passed under the influence of that rude chloroform into death. Conceive what would have been lost—lost to those men who heard Him pray for His murderers; lost to that centurion, whose soldier's heart was taught how to die; lost to the mother, who looked up into His face, whose submission He would never have seen, whose need He would never have considered; lost to that malefactor, that man of piercing vision and daring faith, whose face was turned to Him, who passed hand in hand with Him into the kingdom of heaven! Ay, think of a wider area of loss. Seven great words—seven words of love would never have been spoken.

The value of Jesus' dying hour is not exhausted when we think of the gracious deeds He did, and the conscious words He spoke as He met the last enemy. All His people come to their dying hour. We shall come to that passage of the soul, when we shall breathe our sigh of relief, and say, 'It is finished,' and pass through the vasty hall of death. Precious in His sight were the deaths of His saints. His horizon was not bounded by the faces of that Jewish mob who watched the end, or by the walls of that city under whose shadow He died. He saw the faces of the men and women who should die in His faith and for His love. He would fain teach them and us how to die—with eyes uplifted to God, with unclouded heart, with a great word of Scripture on which to stay the soul, and a prayer of blessing for men upon the lips. He would do more than that. He would comfort His people by the knowledge that there was no experience He had not passed through, no travail He had not endured.

3. Mark the *lights it casts on the ideal of a Christian life.* For what is Christ doing here? He is doing what He did when He veiled His Godhead, when He went down to the wonderful obedience and long seclusion of Nazareth, when He refused the easy ways of life, when He chose the path of holy self-denial. He is facing the duty which must be done, He is fitting Himself for doing it in a supremely noble way, and He is doing it, cost what it may to body and to soul. And that is the ideal of a Christian life.

To-day we have ceased to realize the moral grandeur and the spiritual exaltation of such an ideal. We have ceased to realize that it is the ideal of Jesus. All the sterner stress of His life has fallen out of view. His great words about self-denial and cross-bearing are emptied of meaning, and His hard sayings are discounted. We feel that for us to say we 'are crucified with Christ,' would be to practise cant, and the words are not found upon our lips. The Christian life is not a cramped, mean, narrow round. Every faculty should be sanctified and ennobled by Christ. 'The kingdom of God is righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost,' the three most desirable and most satisfying things in the world. But Jesus insisted that life should first be safe, and then broad, and no liberty was ever given beyond the narrow way of holy and needful self-denial.

4. There is one last lesson which may direct and strengthen some who are in special need. All of us come to times of crisis in our lives. We are called upon to choose or to reject some proffered gift, to take a step which determines all our future, or to accept some limiting conditions. Some burden is placed upon our shoulders which shall slip from us only at death. Some message is given us which shows only a chilling prospect in days to come, or points to a narrowed and straightened life. How many have missed all that makes life worth living, because they have not known the meaning of their hour, and have not seized its blessing. But a still subtler peril—a temptation yielded to every day—is to take up the cup of wine mingled with myrrh; to escape with some easier, and indulgent fulfilment; to find some ignoble palliative; to drug the soul with some base expedient; to escape from a hard life by a loveless marriage; to accept a duty, and fulfil it with meagre sacrifices; to leave the path of a limiting poverty, under the temptation of an unrighteous reward; to lower the ideal of life because it is difficult in new circumstances—these are ways of drinking the cup of wine mingled with myrrh. As we stand at the foot of our cross, let us accept it meekly, and with a holy disdain for all that would unfit us for it, and we shall find it a source of redemption for others, and the very exaltation of

ourselves. Let us remember how Milton met and accepted his great calamity when smitten with blindness and his life little more than half-spent. Well might he have thought that God had shut him up in prison, and so, in sullen despair sunk into apathy, or, in unworthy rebellion, craved some anodyne for his pain. He nobly writes :

God doth not need
Either man's work or his own gifts. Who best
Bear his mild yoke, they serve him best. His state
Is kingly : thousands at his bidding speed,
And post o'er land and ocean without rest ;
They also serve who only stand and wait.[1]

First Sunday in Lent.

'As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he removed our transgressions from us.'—Ps 103^{12}.

This Psalm is one of exceptional exaltation. It combines the ideas of greatness and splendour so as to give a sense of magnificence all through, and it blends with this an exquisite and delicate tenderness. It is natural that such a Psalm should have the question of sin in the heart of it. Until that question has been faced and answered, neither the magnificence nor the tenderness of God can be clear.

Every one who knows himself or who knows life at all has to reckon with the fact of sin. Pride may separate a man from sin, but his mood will change and he will sacrifice pride to indulgence. Time and forgetfulness may seem to leave it on the farther side of a great gulf fixed between it and our present life. But sin can overleap that distance, and in a moment be at our conscience and our heart across a lifetime of intervening years.

But when God enters amid the tumult of fear and hope, of desire and renunciation, all is changed. For the past He brings forgiveness, the mightiest proof of love. For the future, 'God has seen the saint in the sinner,' and what He has seen, the world will yet see. Then comes the supreme moment in a man's experience, the sudden flight of sin beyond the farthest horizon. 'A Greek poet implies,' says Lytton, 'that the height of bliss is the sudden relief from pain ; there is a nobler bliss still, the rapture of the conscience at the sudden release from a guilty thought.'

We are not accustomed to so complete a dealing, and the Bible seems almost to exhaust language in expressing it. We are so accustomed to tinkering with sin, to half-repentances and compromise and recurrence, that few of our moral battles are fought out to a finish and the field cleared from the outposts of the enemy. So the colours are glaring—'crimson and scarlet,' 'white as snow.' God is seen 'coming over the mountains of our transgressions,' and casting them 'into the depths of the sea.' And in this passage East and West stand for a corresponding sense of extreme distance that is meant to tax the imagination. The imaginative power and stretch of the appeal are seen along two lines.

1. Geographically, East and West were the extreme points of known distance. It was in the temperate zone of the northern hemisphere that history began and civilization spread. Accordingly the stretch of ancient geography was wider between East and West than between North and South, and the ancient maps of the world were oblong. As thought travelled westward it saw the dim coasts and islands of the Mediterranean, and perhaps the mountain of Teneriffe in the farthest distance. As it travelled eastward, it passed through the ring of neighbouring nations across the Jordan ; saw the wandering encampments of desert tribes ; then Mesopotamia, with Nineveh and Babylon guarding its rivers ; then the mountains of Persia and the dream-like lands of India and China beyond. At the utmost limits, mountain-pillars upheld the world, or the edge of its oval disc fell sheer into the waters of the nether deep upon which it floated.

One can realize the wonder and relief of such a man as this writer, as his conscience follows his imagination across the whole enormous breadth of the world. There, where the mountains of the dawn or sunset hardly break the skyline with their faint and shadowy ranges—there, over the edges of the flat earth where all things end—there, and no nearer, are his sins.

Geographically, science seems to have changed all that. For a long time travel and exploration increased year by year the distance between East and West, flinging out the horizon line farther in each direction. Yet in doing so, they actually brought them together by their discovery that the earth is round, so that a man fleeing across the world to escape his sin must at last run into its arms. And that is a curious kind of allegory of what our modern thought has done with the sense of sin. Apparently it has removed it. It has drawn away men's attention to other interests, and it has relaxed the ancient tension of conscience. Yet, in very truth, as men escape from sin under the

[1] W. M. Clow, *The Day of the Cross*, 213.

guidance of scientific theory, they rush unawares into the arms of their sins again.

Natural science has revealed the connexion between the physical and the moral natures. Its doctrines of evolution and heredity tend to a view of sin as natural tendency, defective or excessive vitality, a hereditary taint of blood. While, at first sight, these explanations seem to put sin away from conscience, yet they bring it infinitely nearer too. Instead of being a casual or isolated product of mere independent acts of will, they pronounce it native, and part of the necessary system of things. Sin has come home to the very heart and flesh of man, a thousandfold nearer than ever.

What has God to say to all this? Exactly the same old words, 'As far as the east is from the west.' Whatever truth or error may lie in these accounts of the origin of sin, our faith knows only one unchanging fact—the living God. Our conscience has to deal not with theory, but with one great will and love. Against Him, Him only, have we sinned. Here and now, whatever be the story of life behind us, whatever the ultimate scientific definition of sin, we have to meet the eyes of God as Christ reveals Him. By His command, by His forgiveness, by His redemption, He tears sin away from His children and holds it apart from them now as of old. When God has intervened, we repudiate our lower nature, and lay hold on our nobler manhood. Thus, in the Cross of Christ, we see still that great act of God, that is ever repeated when a penitent child turns to his Father. It is the act of justification. Sin has not been slurred over, nor forgotten, nor suffered merely to drift away. 'As far as the east is from the west, so far hath he *removed* our transgressions from us.'

2. East and West are not mere points in the compass; they stand for peopled lands, and even in very ancient times their racial distinctions were recognized. Israel had already touched the outposts of Greece, and had heard of the young power of Rome—not indeed in any close contact, but yet closely enough to perceive the contrast between Europe and Asia, between Aryan and Semite. East and West represent different types of humanity. The East is dreaming, the West running to and fro. The East values a thought for its beauty and its mystery, the West for its practical value. The East fears immortality, and longs for the death of desire, the West rebels against death and seeks for life more abundant. The East lies back in fatalism, the West stands erect in strength of human will.

All this lends a richer significance to the text. We need to be separated from our sins not merely by distance, but by a change of standard and desire. When God enters, and a man deals with Him regarding sin, racial differences of moral standard and constitutional taste disappear. Jesus Christ, standing on that Syrian soil which has been the historic meeting-ground of East and West, changes the views of both, and creates a higher patriotism strong as the lower and far more true. Then men of all races, learning the will of God and His love, take these for their native country, the homeland of their spirit, and sin becomes alien and foreign to them.

What is this but *sanctification*, in which sin is removed not merely by the forgiving act of God, but by the change of man's desire which is the work of His Spirit? No longer regarded as merely dangerous or foolish or wicked, it comes to be literally hateful—uncongenial and utterly alien to his desires and tastes.[1]

Second Sunday in Lent.

Jacob and Israel.

'And Jacob dreamed, and behold a ladder.'—Gn 28^{12}.

'And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day.'—Gn 32^{24}.

There is a story of a Sibyl which we used to read in our Roman History. It tells how that strange prophetess came to one of the early kings of Rome, Tarquinius the Proud, and offered him, at a price, nine precious rolls of parchment. But when the king would not pay the price, she went away. Presently she came back, having destroyed three of them, and offered the remaining six to him for the same price. The king once more refused. But again the Sibyl returned; this time with only three books left. Then the King, amazed at her persistence, bought the three for the same sum as that for which at first he could have had the nine.

Like the books of the Sibyl is the story of Jacob:

> There is a tide in the affairs of men
> Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
> Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows and in miseries.

Twice that tide flowed for the patriarch, but not with equal force; the first one he missed, and when the second chance was given him, he found, as Tarquin found, that it had far less to offer, and its demand was therefore higher.

[1] J. Kelman, *Ephemera Eternitatis*, 67.

1. There is surely no more mixed character than Jacob's in the Old Testament. The fact that, like St. Paul, he is a man of two names, shows us, as clearly as anything can do, that his life was broken in two in the middle—that there was a definite change, a fresh beginning, a new birth. And the very name by which in his earlier life he was known, Jacob the Cheat, is enough to show what there was in him which would make all honest men dislike him.

But what matters now to us, what makes his life so fascinating as a human document, is that he had in him something quite different from all that. Like so many of us, he was two men even from the first. It was not for nothing that on the very night that he was driven out from home, lying there on the bare and rocky hillside, with a stone for his pillow, he dreamed the dream which has been the delight of childhood and of age ever since. It was not for nothing that there, in his misery and loneliness, he saw the ladder whose top reaches to heaven, and heard God's voice speak to him. It is the first of the two great crises of his life. The whole of the Sibylline books with all their words and their wisdom were offered him there at Bethel. But he would not pay the price. The flow of the tide would have carried him right out on God's ocean; but he missed it. It is so much easier to do great things, to make great resolves to dedicate life to a high purpose, before one is twenty-five than it is afterwards. But, though he knew the ladder was there, though he had seen it mounting step by step up to the throne of God, he would not begin to climb it. His dream remained a dream. He went on his way, saying, 'How dreadful is this place'; he journeyed on alone when he might have had all those angels for his companions. Nay, he even tried to make a bargain with God: if He will be with me and give me food and raiment and bring me again in peace, then this God shall be my God. That was the first crisis.

2. Now fourteen years have gone past and Jacob is on the way home again; he was poor then, he is rich now. He had gone out alone to the ravine, where far below the river Jabbok wrestles its way downward, as its name means, among the rocks. And now, as he stands there, having done all he could for safety, the whole of his life passes before him; just as, when a man troubled with insomnia lies awake in bed, he sees his character stripped bare and naked. The house of lies he has built at the cost of his soul is tumbling about his head like a house of cards. Not his wealth only, not his own life only, but the life of those who are dearer to him than himself, is in danger. Perhaps that is his salvation; perhaps that one unselfish thought was the door through which God came to him. However it was, there as he stood alone in the darkness, he was conscious of a power wrestling with him, a power so real, so intense, that it was just as if a man whom he could not see had met him and grappled with him, face to face, and heart to heart; and gathering all his strength, Jacob rose and wrestled, wrestled on, even when he was spent and weary; wrestled on, till the new name was given him, and he had won the blessing which now he longed for more than he longed for all beside.[1]

The anthropomorphism of this story is astonishingly frank and vivid; but it is clear that the Genesis writer intends us to see in it an allegory of inward strife. He is spiritualizing an older and cruder form of the story, which still determines the shape of it; but the soul of it is a new thing in his hands. And later ages have inevitably taken this weird and sombre tale as an allegory of the soul's struggle in prayer. Charles Wesley has so fixed it once and for all in his noble hymn, 'Come, O Thou traveller unknown.' And Francis Thompson, in his essay entitled *Sanctity and Song*, links up the Old Testament story with one of the Canticles attributed to St. Francis of Assisi, which figures the soul's prayer as a warfare with Christ, in which the soul falls to the ground pierced by Christ's lance, only to be raised again by Him:

> So keen fresh that I
> That moment could have scorned
> To join the saints on high.

And thus revivified, the soul returns to the conflict; and, at last, 'I conquered Christ my Lord.'

Ay! for so love teaches us, through its disciplines of pain and piercing, to win that hardihood of utter self-abandonment which makes God yield Himself to our importunity.[2]

Let us end with two thoughts. We must not let any dream go which God has given us. Those dreams of youth which come to us as we read of some noble life, as we go out to start upon our profession; dreams of marriage and heroism, of pity, of service and generous self-sacrifice, of love and devotion, are all meant to be translated into the prose of common life. He who sees the vision and goes on his way is a worse man than he who

[1] G. H. Aitken, *Fellow-Workers with God*, 180.
[2] L. Johnson, *The Legends of Israel*, 98.

never has seen it at all. Every vision is not only a call to action but a promise that, as we strive, we shall attain ; as we seek, we shall find.

But though we have no right to put away the conversion of to-day, because we think that to-morrow will do, yet Jacob stands here to bid us never lose hope for any man. It is false to say that no one is ever really changed after he is thirty. Right on into old age God is seeking for the souls He loves, the souls which Christ died to win for Himself. Here it is God with whom man's fight must be fought, not Apollyon, or sin, or temptation, or his evil self. For it is the final truth of life that God is always following us ; the love of Christ is always waiting to comfort us, through some great call or some great sorrow, through the failure which wrecks our self-confidence, through sickness and the shadow of death, God may come face to face with any one of us. And when He comes, the whole question will be : Do we care enough ? Have we the will, in spite of all the careless years that have gone before, have we the will to rise and wrestle ? For, if we do that, we shall prevail ; and, when the morning comes, on our forehead too, however faintly, the new name will be written.

The Revised Edition of Sir George Adam Smith's Exposition of the Book of Isaiah.[1]

By Professor John E. McFadyen, D.D., United Free Church College, Glasgow.

It is hardly too much to say that the publication of Sir George Adam Smith's *Isaiah* thirty-nine years ago marked the dawn of a new epoch in the exposition of prophecy. The fuel was already there, gathered by the patient toil of many a scholar, but it had not been kindled into light and heat. That is what those volumes did. Here was a writer who combined broad and delicate scholarship with an exquisite literary gift and who, besides, already stood in the front rank of British preachers. The volumes broke upon the English-speaking theological world with all the force of a revelation, and the preachers of that day felt like Keats' 'watcher of the skies, when a new planet swims into his ken.' The prophets, major and minor alike, had been to most preachers practically a *terra incognita* ; those volumes revealed the breadth and beauty and fertility of this unknown land. Praises were showered upon them by scholars and literary men, praises which have been gratefully endorsed by four decades of preachers on both sides of the Atlantic, who were not slow to recognize in them a supreme expository achievement.

It were superfluous to repeat the praises lavished upon those volumes on their first appearance ; suffice it to recall the tribute paid them by Mr. H. Jeffs in his *Art of Exposition* (James Clarke & Co.), after they had been in circulation for more than twenty years. 'The glory,' he says (p. 80), 'of *The Expositor's Bible* series is Dr. George Adam Smith's two volumes on Isaiah and his two volumes on The Book of the Twelve Prophets. These approach as near to perfection in their combination of the fullest and finest scholarship, the vividly dramatic style, the penetrating psychology, the illuminating analogies between the social and spiritual conditions of the prophetic times and our own, and the intensely practical application to present-day problems, as we can reasonably hope anything to come. Dr. Smith has been the making of many a preacher, and dullard indeed would the man be who was not a better preacher, and a keener and more intelligent reader of the prophets, after he had revelled in Dr. Smith's books. Dr. Smith has wonderful intuition of the Oriental mind. The expository preacher who, while maintaining his own independence of thought and style, lives much with Dr. Smith, will be living with a supreme master of the craft, and cannot fail to catch something of the master's zest for the Bible, and through that zest he will be brought spirit to spirit with the great souls to whom the inspiration came which gave to us the Bible literature.'

When it became known that Principal Sir George Adam Smith was engaged in the revision of his work on prophecy, expectation and curiosity were immediately aroused as to the form which the revision would take. It was felt that the homiletic treatment, resting as it did upon

[1] Two volumes (Hodder & Stoughton ; 10s. 6d. net).

accurate and sympathetic exegesis, enriched with illustrations from the broad field of history, and clothed in perfect English, could not be bettered; there was about it a certain finality which was not likely to be seriously, if at all, modified, by the progress of critical or historical studies in the field of prophecy. And this is what we find. The more distinctively homiletic parts have been allowed to stand practically intact, and so those eloquent pages, charged with spiritual insight, which moved and inspired the preachers of nearly forty years ago, are again set free to continue their good work of moving and inspiring the preachers of our own and later days. As a specimen of spiritual exposition and literary craftsmanship, what would be nobler than the words in which Dr. Smith comments on the climax expressed in the couplet at the close of ch. 40, the force of which 'Duhm and others have blindly missed' and foolishly eliminated as an anti-climax? For the sake of younger preachers—if any such there be—who do not know those volumes, we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of quoting the passage in full:

'And so it must ever be. First the ideal, and the rush at it with passionate eyes, and then the daily trudge onward, when its splendour has faded from the view, but is all the more closely wrapped round the heart. For glorious as it is to rise to some great consummation on wings of dream and song, glorious as it is, also, to bend that impetus a little lower and take some practical crisis of life by storm, an even greater proof of our religion and of the help our God can give us is the lifelong tramp of earth's common surface, without fresh wings of dream, or the excitement of rivalry, or the attraction of reward, but with the head cool, and the face forward, and every footfall upon firm ground. Let hope rejoice in a promise, which does not go off into the air, but leaves us upon solid earth; and let us hold to a religion, which, while it exults in being the secret of enthusiasm and the inspiration of heroism, is daring and Divine enough to find its climax in the commonplace.' For sheer beauty, for the blend of music and imagination—to say nothing of its spiritual quality—there surely cannot be many things in the English language finer than that.

It is not therefore, speaking generally, in the homiletic treatment of the prophet that the 'alterations and omissions' to which the Principal alludes in his new Preface are to be found, but rather in his discussion of the textual and literary criticism of the book and of its historical background. If it be asked what these have to do with the preacher and with homiletics, he would answer, 'Much every way.' For more than most men he has taught us that the best homiletic rests on the soundest exegesis, and sound exegesis demands from the expositor, apart from the indispensable endowment of spiritual sympathy, as accurate a knowledge as is possible of the psychological and historical situation out of which the prophet speaks, and of the text in which he expresses himself; for you have no right to discuss what a writer meant until you have taken the necessary trouble to discover as precisely as possible what he said. If the modifications in the purely homiletical treatment are so few, it is because the exegetical foundations were so well and truly laid in the first edition. But it is characteristic of the patient integrity of Sir George Adam Smith's mind that he has re-examined those foundations in the light of the multitudinous labours of the historians and critics of the last forty years. In his own words: 'The textual and historical criticism of the Old Testament has wonderfully developed, our knowledge of the histories of Israel, Babylonia, Assyria, and Egypt has been greatly increased, and in particular many fresh works have appeared on the Book of Isaiah itself. . . . In preparing this New and Revised Edition I have made careful use of all these.'

A careful comparison of the two editions shows that this is, as it claims to be, a real revision. Every syllable of the first edition has been scrupulously weighed, and the tiny and often almost imperceptible changes in style, which reveal the unabated fastidiousness of the literary artist, disclose almost more than the longer additions the conscientious thoroughness with which the revision has been carried through. In general the revision, so far as it affects the literary form, is in the direction of restraint; frequently, *e.g.* in paragraphs which began with *Now*, the *Now* is dropped (cf. ii. 185, 338, etc.). 'This great change' (from idolatry to monotheism) becomes simply 'this change' (ii. 38), and 'the great contrast' (between the idols and the living God) becomes simply 'the contrast.' To dissociate the solemn announcement of the birth of a Child from the current expectation of the coming of a glorious Prince seemed to Dr. Smith in the first edition 'quite impossible,' in the second 'next to impossible.' 'The idea that what Isaiah describes' in ch. 6 'is the temple in Jerusalem' (i. 61), is the 'mistaken' idea in the first edition. In the first edition we read, 'Isaiah's authorship of these prophecies'—*i.e.* chs. 13 f., 24–27, 34 f.—'is usually defended by appealing . . .'; the revision reads, 'has sometimes been defended' (i. 421). To the sentence in the first edition, 'For

all its mingling and recurrent style, the prophecy' (*i.e.* chs. 40–55) 'is a unity with a distinct, if somewhat involved, progress of thought,' is added the cautious footnote, 'That is, as it now lies before us, however true or baseless the different theories of various sources for it may be' (ii. 136). In the first edition, 'there were two branches of the Persian royal family'; in the revision, 'there appear to have been' (ii. 114). In the first edition, 'we have scarcely any contemporary evidence' about the personality of Cyrus; in the revision, 'we have little' (ii. 174). In the first edition, we read, 'As in the rest of Hebrew poetry, so here' (in ch. 53) 'the measure is neither regular nor smooth'; in the revision, 'As in much of Hebrew poetry' (ii. 354). In the first edition, 'Nor is there any reason against attributing' the intercessory prayer of 63^{7}–64 to the same author as chs. 40–55; in the revision, 'Nor is there final reason' (ii. 488). To the assurance of 14^{32} that Zion at least is secure for the people of Yahweh is added a caveat in brackets—'This then was the Interim-Answer (we think from Isaiah himself)' (i. 290); and again it is hinted that the proverb in 28^{20} may not originally belong to its present context (i. 162).

On the field of historical and literary criticism this caution frequently reveals itself in the sphere of chronology. The date of 10^{5-34} is given in the first edition as 721 B.C.; in the revision, as 'after 721 and probably after 717 B.C.' (i. 145, 151). To the date 709 for the oracle 21^{1-10} he still adheres, but in a footnote he recognizes and states the difficulties which have led recent critics to assign it to a later date (i. 282). The second captivity, of 589, becomes 587–586 (ii. 59). Of the section 56^{1-8}, commonly supposed to begin the post-exilic Trito-Isaiah, he writes, 'I am not so sure as I was in 1890 that it belongs to the eve of the Return,' and he adds reasons for the later date which is 'not certain, but possible' (ii. 432). The upper limit of Deutero-Isaiah is perhaps 546 or 545 rather than 549 B.C. (ii. 12).

The steadiness with which Principal Smith, out of a wider knowledge and maturer judgment, still adheres to conclusions reached nearly forty years ago is remarkable evidence of the thoroughness with which his original work was done. While taking full account of all the relevant intervening literature, there is no question of vital importance on which he has had occasion to abandon his earlier conclusions. The words, 'Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be white as snow,' etc. (1^{18}), he declines to regard with Wellhausen as interrogative, or with Duhm as ironical, though he admits that the question is difficult and the answer uncertain (i. 13). To the much disputed question of the authorship of the Messianic passages 9^{2-7} and 11^{1-5} he devotes three and a half pages, as 'it is right that, though I have not changed my belief, I should give some account of such criticism' (i. 142), but 'upon a careful survey of all the arguments, I see no reason now, any more than thirty-eight years ago, to doubt that the Messianic passages are Isaiah's' (i. 144). Similarly he retains 2^{2-4} for Isaiah, though 'quite possibly it is quoted from an earlier poet' (i. 12). Again $28^{5f.}$ are denied to Isaiah 'on, it seems to me, insufficient grounds' (i. 155). Moreover, he is inclined to re-assert against much recent criticism, the Isaianic authorship and the probable unity of 10^{5-34} (i. 171), and the Isaianic authorship of 32^{9-20} (i. 268), though v.^{19} is admitted to be 'probably an interpolation' (i. 275). In an additional page of introduction to ch. 65 he still inclines to a date for it during the Exile (ii. 497 f.). Of $66^{1f.}$—verses which some scholars limit to a condemnation of a rival Temple—he writes: 'The verses surely imply that *no* house is indispensable to God or His true worshippers. . . . I still think this the natural interpretation of the verses.' On the difficult questions of the identity of the Servant in the four Servant Songs, and of the speakers in the fourth Song (ch. 53, at any rate as far as v.^{6}), the discussions of the intervening years have not led him to modify his earlier judgment. The speakers he still thinks to be on the whole Israel rather than the heathen (ii. 364), while his view of the Servant of the Lord is summarily expressed in the following words: 'Our prophet identifies him at first with the whole nation, and then with some indefinite portion of the nation—indefinite in quantity, but most marked in character: this personification grows more and more difficult to distinguish from a person; and in ch. 52^{13}–53 there are very strong reasons, both in the text itself and in the analogy of other prophecy, to suppose that the portrait of an individual is intended' (ii. 292).

But though the broad conclusions of the older edition stand, there are numerous minor modifications. The older edition had stated that the king cursed by Tiglath-pileser as an arch-enemy was Uzziah of Judah; now a footnote tells us that 'there are strong grounds for believing that he was not Uzziah (Azariah) of Judah, but Azrija'u of Ja'udi, a state much nearer Assyria' (i. 96). Another footnote reckons with the possibility that in the Immanuel prophecy of ch. 7 the curds and honey (v.^{15}) may be a symbol not of privation but

of abundance, and that vv.[15f.] may therefore be not a threat but a promise (i. 115). The statement in the old edition (ii. 383) that the question whether the land of Sinim is the land of China 'is still an open one' is now dropped (ii. 399). The possibility is conceded of the author of ch. 33 being another than Isaiah himself (i. 317). There is now a slightly greater readiness to admit the possibility of interpolation: *e.g.* 17[7f.] appear to be interpolations (i. 280), 18[7] 'is now generally regarded as a later addition' (i. 281); again, 'surely grass is the people' (40[7]) is bracketed as a gloss (ii. 83), and it is admitted that the genuineness of 39[6f.], the only prediction of Israel's exile to Babylonia which is attributed to Isaiah, 'has been generally and very reasonably denied.' Perhaps the most important modification is in Sir George Adam Smith's view of ch. 48, which he no longer regards as a literary unit. The criticism of the last forty years has convinced him that, besides authentic lines in the chapter, there are others which are 'not consonant with Deutero-Isaiah's argument, style, or rhythm, but seem to be pious efforts to interline his teaching, in the circumstance and to the men of his own time, with exhortation and rebuke to Jews of a later period and a different character' (ii. 221).

The translation is modified in ways that are always interesting and often important. Sometimes the change is slight, as in 5[16], where *justice* is substituted for *righteousness* (i. 9), or *impious* and *profane* for *hypocrite* in 9[17] (i. 51, 78), or *disregarded* (the ordinance) for *changed* in 24[5] (i. 441), or *gotten* for *received* in 40[2] (ii. 79), or Abraham *My friend* for *who loved me* in 41[8] (ii. 131), or summoner of the generations *from the fountainhead* for *from aforehand* in 41[4] (ii. 127). Once or twice there is a reversion to the familiar English translation, as in 42[1], which formerly read:

> Lo, My Servant! I hold by him;
> My Chosen! Well-pleased is My soul! (ii. 291),

and which now reads:

> Behold My Servant, whom I uphold,
> My Chosen in whom My Soul delighteth (ii. 307).

The old reference to Cyrus in 41[2], 'Who hath stirred up from the sunrise Righteousness, calleth it to his foot?' (ii. 117), gives place to the much superior:

> Who was it stirred up from the sunrise
> Him on whose footsteps victory waits? (ii. 120).

The difficult and obscure עות in 50[4] is more cautiously dealt with. 'To know how to succour the weary with words' (ii. 327) becomes:

> To know how to answer (?) the weary
> With a word that is . . . (?)—

to which translation is appended a valuable footnote. Some of the improvements rest on a careful exploitation of the LXX; *e.g.* 'Food shall they find on *every* (πάσαις) road,' 49[9b] (ii. 399). So 'Who hath directed the *spirit* of Jehovah?' 40[13] (ii. 94) becomes 'Who hath determined the *mind* of Yahweh?' (ii. 95)—a translation suggested by the Greek rendering of רוח as νοῦς. And the beautiful passage, 'In all their affliction *he was afflicted*' (63[8f.]), is corrected to:

> (And so He became their Saviour)
> From all their affliction.
> *No messenger* was it (or angel,
> But His presence that saved them) (ii. 490).

Two features distinguish the translation of the revised edition from that of the original: (i) there is considerably more of it, and (ii) the metrical quality of the verse is made more conspicuous to the eye and to the ear. (i) Sir George Adam Smith has acceded to the desire expressed by former reviewers for a complete translation of chs. 40–66. It greatly facilitates the reader's appreciation of the comment to have under his eye, in metrical form, the poem that is being commented upon. (ii) In the revised edition much that formerly appeared as prose (cf. 2[2-5], and part of 5[1-7]) is now printed as verse—a feature which has the effect of giving the reader a juster appreciation of the essentially poetic quality of prophecy in all the stages represented by the Book of Isaiah. The Principal's profound interest in the problems of Hebrew metre, already attested by his Schweich Lectures, and not less markedly in his 'Jeremiah,' is here reflected in many a page. To a footnote in p. 94 of vol. ii. repeated from the first edition, he adds an explanatory sentence on the metrical structure of 40[12-31]. The nature of the elegiac metre is now made plain by breaking up the long line of the older edition into two. Thus:

> Comfort ye, comfort ye My people, saith your God,
> Speak ye home to the heart of Jerusalem, and call unto her, 40[1f.] (ii. 75).

becomes:

> Comfort ye, comfort ye My people,
> Sayeth your God.
> Speak home to the heart of Jerusalem
> And call to her (ii. 76).

The elegiac structure of 40[9-11] is now more distinctly

recognized. In the first edition the translation of v[11]. ran :

> As a shepherd His flock He shepherds ;
> With His right arm gathers the lambs,
> And in His bosom bears them,
> Ewe-mothers He tenderly leads (ii. 84).

Now we read :

> Like a shepherd His flock He tends,
> With His arm He gathers,
> The lambs in His bosom He bears,
> And those that suckle He gently leads (ii. 85).

There are in these volumes protests not a few, for which his ' Jeremiah ' had prepared us, against the illusion that the metre of Hebrew poetry is uniformly regular ; he does not ' suppose that the Hebrews were so anxious for a mechanical regularity as their modern editors are ' (ii. 80), and so it is with hesitation that he transposes the familiar order of the sentences in 40[4] to :

> Every mountain and hill be brought low,
> Every valley be lifted.

To readers interested in Hebrew one of the valuable features of the revision is the incidental textual comment which accompanies the translation, especially in the volume dealing with chs. 40–66. This feature, which already marked the first edition, has been greatly extended in the revision and is particularly conspicuous in the treatment of ch. 44 and the very difficult ch. 53. Such scrupulous attention to the text is a perpetual reminder of the stern linguistic discipline to which every honest exegete must be prepared to submit himself.

The revision is characterized by omissions as well as additions. The thing that no longer needs to be said is not said. Five sentences, *e.g.* in vol. i. p. 431, which argue that a book bearing Isaiah's name is not necessarily all from the prophet himself, are dropped (ii. 452). But naturally interest will largely centre in the additions, many of which are quite extensive. *E.g.* the introduction to the sections dealing with chs. 25–27 and with the story of Hezekiah's sickness and recovery in ch. 38 have been re-written. So also has the introduction to the story of Sennacherib's campaign(s) against Judah been re-written in the light of the discussion devoted to that difficult question in Dr. Smith's ' Jerusalem ' ; and his conclusion is that there seems to be ' sufficient material to justify the hypothesis that the two accounts ' in chs. 36 f. ' are treating not of the same attempt on Jerusalem, but of two successive attempts by Sennacherib ' (ii. 315). An additional paragraph (ii. 17) suggests reasons for the anonymity of Deutero-Isaiah, and an additional page is devoted to the discussion of the unity of chs. 40–55 and the separableness of the Servant poems (ii. 18). The translation of and comment upon ch. 43 expands one page of the original edition to eight. The exposition of ch. 48, which is no longer regarded as a unity, has been largely re-written. Many minor additions show how closely the intervening literature has been surveyed. A footnote in i. 203 deals with Winckler's identification of Miṣraim and Kush with two North Arabian provinces, and two additional sentences on ii. 110 summarize that scholar's views on the origin of the Medes. To the valuable note on *mishpaṭ* (42[1]) in the first edition is added, ' But like the Arabic *dîn*, *religion* is perhaps the best equivalent ' (ii. 315).

The new edition reckons at certain points with criticisms passed upon the earlier one—*e.g.* with R. H. Hutton's comments on Dr. Smith's comparison of Isaiah to Mazzini (i. 85) and Cromwell (i. 165). A few minor corrections reveal the extreme care with which the revision has been executed : *e.g.* a footnote on ii. 79 corrects and expands an original ' Lev. xxvii.' to ' Lev. xxvi. 41, 43,' and an original ' vii.' (footnote on ii. 183) has been corrected to ' 11 ' (ii. 200). Rénan (i. 350 f.) is corrected to Renan (i. 364 ff.), and ānî (i. 433) to ʿanî (i. 454). In γένους (ii. 308) a breathing has inadvertently slipped in ; in επ' αυτῷ (ii. 357) one has been dropped and another misplaced (ἐπ' αὐτῷ) ; while in footnote [1] to ii. 155 ' to ' has slipped out after ' access.'

The former system of transliteration has been slightly modified, P being represented by ḳ, and ע by ṣ, so that we have now Rabshaḳeh, Ṣion and Ṣedheḳ (instead of Seedheg)—also Yahweh for Jehovah of the first edition.

Principal Smith has resisted the temptation to illustrate the book extensively by experiences of the Great War, but the few allusions to it are significant. Commenting on 61[1], he adds to the instances of the vital and paramount influence in a nation's history of a piece of news, these two : ' the announcement in August 1914, that the British Government had decided to support, by force of arms, its pledge to defend the inviolableness of Belgium,' and ' the news, in 1917, that the United States, after long patience with the Germans, had, in their deliberation, decided that our decision was right, and resolved to join us ' (ii. 476). On 40[5] he comments thus : ' *The glory of the Lord was revealed, and all flesh saw it together.* One might say the same of the

unanimity with which Great Britain, on the strength of moral convictions, rose to the venture of war in 1914, and was ultimately vindicated' (ii. 82).

Any one who has ever attempted to revise his own or another man's work soon discovers how exacting and vexatious a task it is—more difficult in some ways than to re-write it *de novo*. An incidental but illuminating proof of the toil that lies behind work like this is the tiny change from *once* (ii. 43) to *often* in the sentence, 'Having read through the Book of Jeremiah often again since I wrote the above paragraph, I am more than ever impressed with the influence of his life upon Isa. 40–66' (ii. 44). But in bringing the literary and historical criticism of the book abreast of contemporary scholarship, Dr. Smith has recalled the expository preachers of to-day to the same high conception of Biblical science as he set before the preachers of forty years ago.

This is indeed a dangerous book, as all Dr. Smith's expositions of prophecy are. The thing is here so ideally well done that the preacher who puts himself under the spell of it, only too conscious that nothing that he is ever likely to do will be remotely comparable to it, is tempted either boldly to reproduce it, or to despair of touching it himself to any similar purpose at all. But if used wisely and not slavishly, it may be to him a perpetual source of guidance and inspiration. We part from this revision with a deepened sense of the complexity of Biblical science, of the wide and varied range of knowledge of which one who aspires to be a true expositor must make himself master, and of the importance of imagination as well as of knowledge and scholarship in the task of exposition. If it be not an impertinence to congratulate one whose praise has for forty years been in all the churches, we extend our congratulations to Sir George Adam Smith on achieving a revision as complete and thorough as the original was admirable.

The Muhammadan Agrapha.

By the Reverend R. Dunkerley, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Cambridge.

III.

We now come to the fullest and most important study of this subject that has yet been made—that of Michaël Asin y Palacios, entitled *Logia et Agrapha Domini Jesu apud Moslemicos Scriptores, asceticos præsertim, usitata*. Asin is the Professor of Arabic at Madrid University, and the writer of several other valuable books. This work appeared in two parts, the first in 1916, the second during last year.[1] Part I. consisted of a collection of one hundred and three passages from the aforementioned book by Al Ghazzali, in Arabic, with variant readings from parallel passages in other authors, and Latin introduction, translation, and notes. Part II. contains one hundred and twenty-two passages in Arabic and Latin, culled from other writers than Al Ghazzali, and similarly annotated, with eight other passages, of which the Arabic is not given. This makes a grand total of two hundred and thirty-three passages—by far the largest collection of such excerpts made up till now. Whether the store is exhausted remains to be seen. It may be added that Asin gives three valuable indices at the end of his lengthy work.

The greater part of the material in Part I. was already familiar to us through Margoliouth's collection, practically all the sayings of which find a place here, though Asin gleaned them quite independently and had not read Margoliouth when he wrote. The residue does not consist entirely of agrapha—though there are several which Margoliouth missed—for Asin includes a number of apocryphal tales of the fantastic sort, and quite a group of sayings and stories connected with John the Baptist, Zachariah, and Mary—which do not really belong here at all. In Part II. we have almost entirely new matter, but here, too, the passages do not all contain sayings ascribed to Jesus, some being referred to these other characters; there is, also, as before, an element of legend, Christ raising a man, for example, who appears wearing red-hot shoes as a punishment for unbrotherly conduct.

A number of passages in both parts are evidently loose quotations from the Gospels; others show

[1] *Patrologia Orientalis*, xiii. 3; xix. 4.

more or less clear evidence of being paraphrases or meditations based upon them. But a considerable number remain which seem to be quite independent, and the question we have to consider is whether it is conceivable that they preserve any authentic words of Jesus at all or whether they are entirely fiction. The fertility of invention amongst early Muhammadan writers was extraordinary, and their writings contain innumerable traditions regarding their Prophet, a small percentage only of which can be deemed genuine.[1] It is not surprising, then, that they allowed their imaginations to play around the figure of Jesus also, and without any doubt this is sufficient explanation of most of the agrapha we are considering. The point to be resolved is whether there is any reason to suppose that a little good grain may somehow have survived amongst the mass of weeds.

In his notes, Asin quotes anything mentioned by Al Ghazzali or the allied writers regarding the sources of the sayings or the history of their transmission, and adds any thoughts of his own about their connexion or lack of connexion with the Gospels. Some of his points are of considerable interest and value, but he never gives a very pronounced opinion upon the question of authenticity. Care must be taken not to read into such a statement of his as, 'Agraphum mihi videtur esse,' more than he intends. Regarding this, he has written privately to me thus, 'J'ai employé le mot *Agrapha* au sens *non strict*, soit, pour les *verba* de NS Jésus-Christ qui n'étant pas dans les Évangiles *peuvent être supposés* comme transmis depuis les premiers siècles chrétiens par tradition orale ou non écrite des fidèles ou des hérétiques, qui les auraient ainsi communiqué aux musulmans. C'est donc une tradition chrétienne de paroles attribuées à Jésus, dont l'authenticité est très discutable.' His idea is that those passages only are properly called agrapha which may, with reasonable probability, be deemed pre-Islamic, whether or not they can be thought genuine; others, which are included in the collection because ascribed to Jesus, he considers presumably paraphrases of the Gospel or products of the imaginative activity of early Muhammadan writers.

The introduction is of special value, I consider, because, though slight, it does discuss the origin of these sayings without the apologetic bias discernible in Zwemer and other writers. Asin stresses the absence as a rule of dogmatic purpose in the passages, and the fact that the evident motive behind the use of them was the desire to give the authority of Jesus to certain moral and ascetic teachings. He thinks that in view of the known influx of Arabian Christians (Nestorians and others) into Islam, the presence of some traditional elements cannot be deemed impossible.[2] He makes much of the argument that in the arid soil of Islam there was produced the tree of monasticism, and that no other explanation is possible than that it grew from a Christian seed. While disclaiming any attempt to assign each of these agrapha to its correct source or to assess finally their value, he is clearly of opinion that authentic matter is involved and that they are of greater worth than has commonly been supposed.

It must probably be agreed that he speaks too confidently in the following passage: 'Without doubt the *Logia* ascribed to Jesus by Muslim writers are connected with a settled Christian tradition among the Oriental churches, orthodox or heterodox, before the seventh century A.D. Now I do not say that this tradition is entirely free from error: indeed, it has been corrupted by the traditionists; yet not intentionally, but rather from the accidents inseparable from all oral tradition. The simple choice of words, the ingenuous character of the narrative, full as it is of anachronisms, both as to time and place, point to the vehicle of transmission being not written but oral tradition handed on in the first place by the common people before it was recorded by theologians.'[3] But if this is an extreme view, the truth probably lies somewhere between it and the opposite extreme of denying *in toto* the connexion of this material with primitive tradition.

He refers to Zwemer and others to show how this material has been largely ignored hitherto; but he was himself unaware of Margoliouth's work when he wrote this introduction. He mentions several writers as quoting a few Muhammadan agrapha incidentally. Of these, D'Herbelot's view was that all these Muhammadan passages had their basis in the Gospels but that they were manipulated to suit the writers' purposes;[4] Asin quotes this statement to argue against it. The

[1] See Guillaume's *The Traditions of Islam*, p. 28 f.

[2] An interesting chapter on Christianity in Early Islam will be found in R. Bell's recent work, *The Origin of Islam in its Christian Environment* (1926); he demonstrates the considerable extent of 'popular importation' into Islam through converts from Christianity, but principally in the ascription of sayings of Jesus to Muhammad. No actual agrapha are included in this study.

[3] The translation is Guillaume's, *op. cit.* p. 147.

[4] *Bibliothèque Orientale* (1781), p. 294.

relevant chapter in Goldziher's work[1] has been published in English (1902) under the title *Hadith and the New Testament*; his position is similar to that of D'Herbelot.

Two references to Asin may be briefly dealt with here. Rendel Harris reviewed his work in the *Expositor* (August 1918), speaking highly of it, and though he warns his readers not to expect here an increase of historical matter relating to Jesus, he calls attention to several sayings that he thinks do preserve sound tradition. A more important reference to Asin is that of Guillaume, who published in 1924 the most scholarly study in English of the Hadith literature, entitled *The Traditions of Islam*,[2] referred to above in two footnotes. In the course of this, while showing conclusively the extravagance that was responsible for much of the amazing growth of tradition in Islam, he refers appreciatively to Asin and quotes part of his introduction (as we have seen) as well as several of the sayings. Though not saying so explicitly, his view apparently is that as in the case of the Hadith that refer to Muhammad himself, so in these relating to Jesus the fact that much is evidently false must not be taken to mean that the whole body of material is necessarily destitute of historical foundation.

Brief reference may be made here to two recent books on the agrapha which, unlike many earlier studies, do take notice of these Muhammadan sayings, though without any critical judgment. In 1923, Besson, in his *Les Logia Agrapha*, included an appendix on this question; his view is shown by the fact that he quotes D'Herbelot's statement referred to above without mentioning Asin's argument to the contrary. He cites thirteen passages from the Quran, forty-four from Asin's collection, and seven others from Ropes; he falls into the usual error of ignoring the last two instalments of Margoliouth's list. The other book is Jenkinson's *The Unwritten Sayings of Jesus* (1925); he devotes an undue part of his space to this subject, giving one of his six chapters to the 'Gospel of Barnabas,' from which he quotes six parables, and another chapter to 'Jesus in Islam.' In the course of this he cites several extracts from the Quran and about a score of the agrapha, without, however, mentioning any of the literature of the subject or giving any references. At the end, he makes one distinctly unfortunate mistake; the last passage quoted is a beautiful little story of the childhood of Jesus from Mrs. Rhys Davids' *Old Creeds and New Needs* (p. 120), but the context there makes it clear that it is a little bit of pure fiction with no other authority behind it than her own imagination. By quoting it where he does, Jenkinson gives the impression that it has been culled from some Muhammadan writer, and he further suggests this by writing 'Isa, son of Mary' —a usual mode of expression—in place of Mrs. Davids' 'Jesus' and 'Yesu' (she quaintly uses both forms). The passage should have been entirely excluded from a work dealing with ancient material —the flotsam and jetsam of early Christianity.

IV.

Without suggesting that it is possible to pick out many gems from amongst this mass of rubble, which is undoubtedly a sufficient description of these Muhammadan agrapha in the bulk, there are one or two points that I consider require brief mention in support of Asin's view that some genuine fragments may have survived even here.

(1) Has the significance of the fact been adequately recognized in this connexion that the canonical tradition of the growth of the Church deals only with its westward movement and that in the nature of things there must have been a considerable movement eastward too? That Rome was in those days the strategic centre of the world is more evident to us than it can have been to the Early Church—even Paul's statesmanship only gradually came to realize its importance (Ac 16^{7} 19^{21}), while the fullest recognition of the necessity for its evangelization could not possibly absolve those from going east and south who believed they had received a commission to make disciples of 'all nations.' It seems probable that there is an underlying stratum of truth in the legends that make Thomas the apostle of Parthia,[3] and of Bartholomew preaching in Cilicia Tracheia.[4] But an appreciation of the probability that a wider work was undertaken by those who had heard Jesus than that narrated in the N.T. surely carries with it the thought that in some out-of-the-way corners of Arabia or Mesopotamia jottings of otherwise unrecorded words of Jesus may for long have been cherished. It is worth noticing that Bigg[5] came to the conclusion that the 'Clementine

[1] *Muhammedanische Studien* (1889).

[2] I have followed Guillaume in adopting the spelling 'Muhammad' (and parallel forms), except where quoting the words of other writers.

[3] *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, vol. x. No. 1.

[4] *Expositor*, October 1902.

[5] *Studia Biblica*, ii. p. 192.

Homilies'—in which several agrapha are found—originated in one 'of those Jewish communities which refused to cast in their lot with the Catholic Church. They maintained themselves in some sort of vitality down to Muhammadan times, and traces of their influence can be discovered in Islam.' He says that a Muhammadan writer of the tenth century gives a glimpse of such a remote little company 'dwelling in the fens between the Arabian desert, the Euphrates, and the Tigris.'

(2) Then, when we scrutinize these passages, surely respect should be paid to any where the ascription to Jesus is definite, unchallenged, and of early date; especially should we notice cases where there are several witnesses for a saying and other signs of sound tradition lying in the background. Take, for example, the following:

> 'God revealed to Jesus: When I come to the heart of one of my servants and find therein nothing of love either for this world or for the future life, then with love of me will I fill him and hold him in my care as a friend' (A 90; M 69).[1]

Asin quotes several other writers than Al Ghazzali as agreeing on the authority from whom this passage comes, in one case a link being affirmed with Damascus—which is obviously one of the most likely places from which agrapha might come. Remembering that the Gospels contain examples of what may be termed the 'spiritual autobiography' of Jesus (the temptation story, for instance), this seems just the kind of thing we can suppose He would tell His disciples on one of those holy occasions when He spoke to them of His inner life. Another example is the story (which need not be quoted at length) of a happy invalid whose praise to God under much affliction is followed by healing (A 88; M 67). Asin quotes a statement that the authority for this story was a certain convert from Judaism to Islam who lived in the seventh century, and that it was told in his book *Israelite Traditions*, which included many Bible narratives from both Testaments. Stripped of its legendary accretions it is fully in the spirit of the Gospels.

(3) Again, if a passage comprises teaching which is alien to or actually opposed to Islam, this should clearly raise a query as to its possible Christian origin. It is, of course, not always certain what does contradict Islam, for the Quran and its commentators are not entirely consistent. But some points do seem fairly definite, especially in regard to the asceticism which is so prominent in many of these sayings. Here Rendel Harris may be quoted.[2] He says that the Muhammadan ascetic writers 'reinforced their doctrine, for which there is little enough in the way of encouragement in the Koran, by an appeal to the authority and teaching of Jesus. This they could not have done if Jesus had not, for them, appeared in the light of an ascetic, or at least a mystical teacher. That sets one thinking at once. . . . Our own current interpretation of Jesus has always minimised the ascetic element in his teaching, and has made little of its mystical side. . . . Quite other appears to have been the view of the Sufi saints and confessors, as we shall see when we come to look at some of the sayings that they have conserved about him, or evolved from their inner consciousness as things which he ought to have said (perhaps did say in part).' To this may be added his comment on this striking passage:

> 'Have no regard to the riches of the Gentiles, who are of this world, for the dazzle of their riches will take away the light of your faith' (A 74; M 63).

'What makes me think this saying is genuine,' he says, 'is not merely its evident spiritual value, but the fact that it is expressed in biblical language. What has a Moslem to do with "riches of the Gentiles"? but it says in Isaiah, "Ye shall eat the riches of the Gentiles," and Jesus appears to be contradicting the prophecy and setting it on one side. It must be true.' This is an exaggerated statement, but there is certainly some force in his main contention.

(4) Finally, in a number of these sayings there is an aptness and conciseness of expression which reminds us forcibly of the precision and point so noticeable in many Gospel texts—there is just that fitness which marks so many canonical sayings of Jesus. They put aspects of the truth so well that, once known, they almost inevitably enter into our religious vocabulary. The following are a few examples:

> 'Take not the world for your lord, lest it take you for its slaves' (A 34; M 35).
>
> 'He who asks pardon from God for those who have done him injury puts an evil spirit to flight' (A 33; not in M).
>
> 'I indeed love poverty, riches I hold in hatred' (A 73; not in M).

[1] It will be convenient to make use of this obvious shorthand, A=Asin, M=Margoliouth.

[2] *Expositor*, August 1918.

'He who sows malice shall reap repentance' (A 140; not in M).

'Revere God in the secrecy of your hearts, as you revere him in public' (A 161; not in M).

'Beware of glances, for they plant passion in the heart, and that is a sufficient temptation' (A 23; M 27).

'Be in the midst, yet walk on one side' (M 3; not in A).

Of this last, Margoliouth remarks that the context in which it is quoted deals with cases in which it is necessary to avow friendship while concealing enmity. But it is, of course, quite possible for a saying to be quoted in a different sense from that intended, and the meaning here surely is that Christians are to be *in* the world but not *of* it; it suggests this truth so strikingly that it is not difficult to think it authentic.

Now, of course, none of these points amounts to demonstration, and it is not possible to accept any of the agrapha with complete confidence. But, at the same time, it certainly seems to me unsatisfactory just to rule them all out as imaginative exaggeration; I feel with Asin and Guillaume that there is something to be said for the hypothesis that genuine fragments are included, though it is not possible to attain any high degree of probability in the identification of them.

V.

We have now to take up and deal slightly with a point already mentioned. Reference was made above to Toland's theory that Muhammad and his successors were indebted to the 'Gospel of Barnabas' for their knowledge of Jesus; he asserted that during a brief examination of this rare work he had discovered several sayings of Jesus cited by Muhammadan writers, though not those quoted by LW. Without actually querying the good faith of this statement—which it is impossible to verify, as he gives no actual examples—it may now be definitely affirmed that his theory is unsound, and that whatever the source of the Muhammadan agrapha it was not this strange Gospel. The publication of it in 1907 by Lonsdale and Laura Ragg from the only known MS.—an Italian one lodged at Vienna—has settled many problems that had been raised by the previous scanty reference to it, amongst them this idea of Toland's. It may be regarded as proved that the book is a mediæval Muhammadan romance, the work of some renegade Christian; there is no trace of an Arabic original, such as modern Muhammadans affirm exists, and the balance of evidence points to the probability that their knowledge of the work is actually the result of the remarks made by Sale in the introduction to his translation of the Quran. From a number of points the following may just be mentioned as conclusively proving that Toland was mistaken:

(1) The stories of the nativity and boyhood of Jesus are almost exactly as in the canonical Gospels in contrast to the legendary tales of the Quran and the Hadith literature.

(2) It contains several references to Gabriel, but none of these corresponds to the one familiar to us from these agrapha (M 1).

(3) There is an odd suppression of all reference to John the Baptist, whereas he is a frequent figure in these sayings, as we have already seen.

(4) I have been unable to identify in it *any* of the two hundred or more passages we have been considering in this article.

It is clear, then, that no light is to be gained from this document as to the original location of these Muhammadan agrapha, or the way in which they were transmitted to those who cited them.

This Gospel is, however, interesting in a different way. It is possible, though not proved, that this remarkable writer made use of an early apocryphal or gnostic work of the same name as that which he gave to his book; such a 'Gospel of Barnabas' is known to have existed in the fifth century,[1] and this hypothesis would account for several features of the work before us. The editors discuss the matter fully and seem inclined to accept the idea; they mention in particular as possibly belonging to such a *Grundschrift* some parables which they consider 'of great beauty' and alien to Muhammadan thought. I have quoted several of these elsewhere as conceivably therefore incorporating Christian teaching from an early date, or even vague recollections of what Jesus said, but the possibility is very remote and need not be further dwelt upon.[2]

[1] See Hastings' *D.B.* v. p. 438.

[2] See *The Unwritten Gospel*, chap. xxi.

Contributions and Comments.

St. Paul's Eucharist.

Acts 20^{6-12} is interesting: it gives us the earliest account we have of a Celebration of the Holy Communion: we have here a Celebration of the Holy Communion at which St. Paul was the Celebrant. The hour at which the service was held is noteworthy—close after midnight or very early in the morning. It has been inferred, because the Holy Communion was on this occasion held after midnight and very early in the morning, that such was the usual hour for the Holy Communion in the earliest years of Church history. It is the purpose of this note to point out that this inference is very doubtful, as it overlooks a fact which lies on the surface of the narrative.

At the time represented by Acts 20 the Lord's Day or the Christian Sunday began, according to Jewish custom, at sunset. The exact hour at which the Lord's Day services were held is uncertain, but it must have been sometime after sunset. Whether the Agape preceded or followed the Breaking of the Bread is disputed, but one point is clear—the service of prayer, praise, and preaching preceded the Breaking of the Bread. The exact time, therefore, of the Breaking of the Bread depended on the length of the preceding service of prayer, praise, and preaching. On this occasion the preliminary service was of unusual length: it was prolonged by the length of St. Paul's sermon and by the accident to Eutychus: we are told as if it were something exceptional that 'Paul was long preaching' and that he 'continued his speech until midnight.' It was owing therefore to these two causes—the length of St. Paul's sermon and the accident to Eutychus, that the Breaking of the Bread took place after midnight or very early in the morning; for, if St. Paul had preached a sermon of ordinary length, and if the accident to Eutychus had not taken place, the service of the Breaking of the Bread would have been held sooner, before midnight, and not very early in the morning. The true inference, therefore, from this passage seems to be that the usual hour for the Celebration of the Holy Communion in the earliest years of Church history was not very early in the morning but very late in the evening. It was not until the Church adopted the Roman custom of beginning the day at midnight that an early morning hour became the usual time for the Breaking of the Bread.

W. E. P. Cotter.

Edinburgh.

Note on Luke ii. 49.

The reason for Mary's anxiety is easily understood, but we do not so readily perceive what moved Jesus to make the reply, 'Did you not know I had to be at my Father's?' These words suggest she might have inferred where He would be, when His whereabouts in Jerusalem were unknown. It is a strange beginning to the *Divine* story of Jesus' life. It would undoubtedly come from the lips of Mary. Its strangeness is a strong guarantee for its historicity. Inference and imagination may have a place in helping to a true interpretation of the first recorded words of Jesus.

They are spoken in the Temple at a Passover feast. To all pious Jews a visit to Jerusalem then was uplifting. Jesus, now a boy of twelve, came to this feast, mayhap was in the capital for the first time. He was now at the age to take His place as a responsible worshipper in the courts of the Temple. Like all well-taught children of a godly home He would be glad to go up to the house of God. He would be glad to think of God's loving-kindness in the courts of His Temple. He would have been told by His mother of souls thirsting for God. When now in Jerusalem He was present where He Himself could behold the beauty of the Lord, inquire in His Temple, worship in the beauty of holiness, get the blessing they received that rightly approached God in His holy place, Jesus would expect a blessing there as no doubt Mary said she had received on her visits. In Jesus' life, the beauty of Nature, its majesty and kindliness, had entered His soul as He roamed the country round Nazareth. In His communion with Nature He was so near the warm heart of God, He could almost feel it beat. He would expect the impression to be much deeper when He communed in God's chosen dwelling with the Father of Spirits.

He who spoke to Samuel at the ark (1 S 3), to Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Amos, and other prophets, seems to have spoken to the heart of Mary's child at this visit, and revealed that He was in a special sense God's Son. If on one able to grasp sublime ideas, a great thought dawns, it can touch the depth of his being, can be a master-principle in life. This revelation filled the heart and thought of Jesus. It ruled in all His movements ever after. When this child of God, God's Son, as was no other child in human form, entered the Temple, He felt

remarkably at home, as much so as, or perhaps more than, in Joseph's house at Nazareth. The new relation evoked engrossing thoughts. The communion with God, following His reception of sonship, was so entrancing all else was forgotten. New vistas were opening, mighty deeds disclosed. The new relation brought a higher, deeper love that met the new needs. There was thus excluded for the time thought about the days. He could but continue engrossed with His Father's presence. It thus came about that when the day came for return, He was not with Joseph and Mary when they set out for Nazareth. They thought, as other parents would, that He was with other boys of their familiar acquaintance, as no doubt He had been often. When He did not appear, they began a search, and with growing anxiety, as it proved of no avail. Returned to Jerusalem, they heard of a wondrous boy in the Temple, and on going there found to their amazement their child sitting amid the teachers of the Law. In her maternal grief Mary gives vent to her annoyance, and the reply Jesus gives is, she might have known where He was to be found when in Jerusalem.

How was it so? Mary, like all pious Jewish mothers, had often talked of the Temple in Zion, of the wonders of grace shown by Jehovah to His people. Would not the hearts of mother and child have been enraptured at remembrance of the deliverances recalled by the past days? Had not Mary seen her boy's face glow as they talked of these events? What joy it would be to join the thanksgiving on the day of solemn assembly. Mary could learn from the deep questions Jesus put, many of which she might not answer, how eager her Son was to know about the ways of God. Did not, now and again, they agree they would need to get the answer from some doctor of the law? Such experiences make Jesus' reply at once natural and intelligible.

But now about Mary's inability to think in this way? Mary was a woman with a heart touched by and responsive to the Divine. But she was a woman of her age and race. She looked for a Messiah after the flesh. This coloured her interpretation of the angel message that God would give her Son the throne of His father David. Her heart was too little Divine, too satisfied with current forms of religion to be like Psalmist and prophet thirsting for the living God. She had not Jesus' spirituality, and so she never divined how He was drawn to God when God was seen in His Sanctuary by souls longing to behold His face. Yet Jesus thinks that from what she had seen of Him, what His words and longings and questions showed, that when He had the opportunity He was sure to use it, to be as much as possible in the house of God. Such views make the words of both Jesus and His mother natural in the circumstances of their meeting in the Temple at that time.

If the view is correct that holds it was at this Passover that Jesus first knew Himself to be in a special sense God's Son, v.[51] is set in a wondrous light. Jesus, knowing this relationship, goes back to do His mother's messages and help in Joseph's workshop. It is God's will that every son of His should learn from Jesus' demeanour to be filial in his home, however lowly that be. Such conduct shows a Divine spirit.

One cannot help joining these first words with the cry at the last, 'My God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?' The love of the Father, first known at this Passover in great fulness, grew ever better known in the years that followed. What agony when it clouded! What love to the Father when it held on to bearing and doing His will on the cross when He had to feel forsaken! How dread the strength of sin that could be broken only by a love so mighty!

G. Philip Robertson.
Edinburgh.

The Unjust Steward.

The Parable of the Unjust Steward bristles with difficulties, it is true, but these are not confined to our Lord's use of such a parable at all, and the ordinary view as to the application He extracts from it. They are found also in the picture He seems to paint of the complacency of the rich man in the face of the writing down of his assets by his debtors, and the consequent loss of anything from twenty to fifty per cent. of his takings on these accounts. A further difficulty lies in attempting to believe that debtors would have the effrontery to withdraw that proportion of their commitments in the very presence of the man most concerned. Such things do not happen in the East to-day, and we are safe in holding that they did not happen then.

The construction of a parable so far removed from the actualities of the situation is altogether opposed to the method of our Lord as we see it in the other works of this great Master of Parables.

I suggest that underlying this parable is a recognized custom of the time, acquaintance with which was assumed by our Lord on the part of

His hearers. To understand the custom is to get at the heart of the Parable, and to understand its application.

The situation seems to be as follows. The rich man is a wholesale seller of wheat and olive oil—not a 'merchant' who trades in small quantities of jewels or other commodities. To attend to the details of the business is not his forte, perhaps not even his inclination. In this department he employs a managing clerk or steward (Moffatt, 'factor'). The salary which the clerk receives is not adequate to the scale of living which he has set for himself as an employee of so great a 'House.' He has been 'making the money fly,' as did the Prodigal in his spacious days. But what money? The gossips of the town said that it was his master's. He, however, knew that it was not, and at the clearing up his master learned it also. So too did the clients when their turn came, and to their great satisfaction. The money with which he was playing had been obtained in what Eastern custom regarded as a perfectly legitimate way; in fact through the operation of a system known farther east as 'squeeze,' by which a man paid himself wholly or in part by what he could get over and above the stated charges. The publicans practised it under Roman rule, and were not hated for that. The only condemnation which arose was when they carried it too far. This the steward does not seem to have done. It is no part of the indictment against him, for rates of interest range high in the East. In return for the palpable advantages of reasonable prices and timely accommodation he had added his own percentage of squeeze to the amount which they owed to the master, and they entered the totals with their own hand, not forgetful of the benefits which the percentage represented. It was what they would call a fair deal, or at least a legitimate one.

And the master thought so too, for his only concern was that the bonds in hand should tally with the goods which had left his store.

But the day of reckoning came at last. Gossip might be a lying jade, but she pointed to practices so clever as to make it uncertain just how far the man would go. Might he not some day overstep the rather blurred line between *meum* and *tuum*, and at last be caught with his hand in his master's pocket? The risk was too great; he must go.

But even in his fall he remains a clever man. He cannot afford to get at cross-purposes with his employer, for there were 'extortioners' in those days, official extortioners of whom he was not one. And, on the other hand, there was poverty to face if he, with only one talent and no field for the exercise of it, were to go out into the world friendless and alone. So he summons the clients, and one by one he hands them back their bond, and gets them to write out of the bill the percentage which he had charged for his favours, and to which they had consented. By this stroke of magnanimity he secures their friendship—for what it is worth, our Lord subtly reminds us—and leaves his master, without a stain upon his character. A truly clever man! A typical 'child of this generation.'

With this in mind the application becomes obvious, and wholly consistent with our Lord's teaching elsewhere. 'You can gather to yourself useful and even helpful friendships if you will make "filthy lucre" your servant and instrument. But bear always in mind that such gains can only be as lasting as the money itself—a tent which, though it bear the name of "eternal," must some day, and certainly, be dissolved. But remember that even this getting has its dangers. The art may grip you, and its rewards be your only prize. But for My followers there is better far than that, the True Eternal, and this will come to him who sets his heart upon the highest, and bends to its pursuit those talents which the children of this world waste on the "eternal tents."'

J. Steele.

Ipswich.

St. Paul and Empedocles.

Most commentators in dealing with 1 Co 2^9, 'As it is written, Eye hath not seen . . .' refer to the question of the source of the quotation. Some point to Is 62^{15} 64^{2-4} 65^7 for some verbal similarities, though admittedly there is no similarity in thought. Others refer to the Apocalypse of Elias as the source of the quotation, or if not a source, then a duplicate quotation from some unknown writing. Generally, however, the problem as to the source is given up as unsolved.

Now the late Professor S. H. Butcher in his book on *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius*, has as the first essay, 'What we owe to Greece.' Speaking therein (p. 4) of Empedocles he quotes from some fragments presumably as follows:

τὸ δ' ὅλον μὰψ εὔχεται εὑρεῖν·
οὕτως οὔτ' επιδερκτὰ τάδ' ἀνδράσιν
οὔτ' ἐπακουστὰ οὔτε νόῳ περι λητά.

This he translates (who, knowing nothing)—'boast that they have found out the whole—an

idle boast; for this the eye of man hath not seen, nor hath his ear heard, nor can his mind conceive it.'

I do not remember having seen any reference made to this quotation, though the eagle eye of Dr. Rendel Harris will have surely seen it long ago.

On the other hand, the Bampton Lecturer for 1926 states confidently (p. 99) that, apart from 1 Co 15^{33}, 'St. Paul nowhere in his Epistles betrays any acquaintance with any work of Greek literature.'

D. JOHN.

Gowerton, S. Wales.

Entre Nous.

Friedrich von Hügel.

In July of last year a volume of *Selected Letters, 1896–1924*, and prefixed with a Memoir by Bernard Holland, was published by Messrs. Dent (21s. net). Already, in the beginning of 1928, a reprint has been necessary. So far as incident goes, von Hügel's life was uneventful and it is hardly necessary to recapitulate it. His father was an Austrian; at the time of Friedrich's birth he was minister at Florence at the court of the Grand Duke. His mother was a Scottish woman. When Friedrich was fifteen the family came to England, and after that he spent most of his time in this country, although he only became naturalized after the outbreak of war. All his life he was associated with the Modernist party in the Roman Catholic Church, Father Tyrrell being his greatest friend. The Church that he loved did not cast him out as it did Tyrrell, but ceaseless care was necessary. Dom Butler, writing in the *Tablet* after his death, said: 'The Authorities no doubt knew the religious influence he was wielding in circles outside the Catholic Church, and did not think it advisable that that influence should be weakened, or that work impeded, especially as the writings were of a kind little likely to be read by many beyond those for whom they were intended; and also the Authorities well knew the man himself. . . . Von Hügel was a quite extraordinary religious influence, bringing home persuasively to minds enmeshed in the theories of Pantheism, Monism, Idealism, Materialism, all the various philosophical misbeliefs that hold captive such great tracts of the modern thinking mind, the great theistic truth of the transcendent, spiritual, personal God, and man's relation to Him. The range of his influence over religious philosophical thought in Great Britain, in America, and also in Germany, may be gauged by the sale of his books, phenomenal in the case of such very tough reading, calling for equally tough thinking.'

The influence which he exercised over the widest religious circles is the more remarkable when we remember how small was his literary output. He was almost sixty when his first important work appeared, 'The Mystical Element of Religion.' His third work was 'The German Soul,' and this was followed by two volumes of Essays and Addresses, the last published posthumously. His second work was 'Eternal Life.' The inception of this was due to Dr. Hastings, who commissioned him to write an article on the subject for the ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. In September 21st, 1911, he says: 'I am now again hard at it—this time at a paper on "Eternal Life" for Hastings' *Encyclopædia*.' But the subject got hold of his mind to such an extent that when it came in it was hopelessly long. Even in a work which gave a most liberal allowance of space to important subjects, sixty double-column pages, which is what this article would have taken, was found impossible. A happy solution was the publication of 'Eternal Life' in book form by Messrs. T. & T. Clark.

Mr. Claude Montefiore, speaking of the Baron's writings on one occasion, said: 'But the books, great as they may be, are but a fraction of the man. The great scholar-saint was much more than any book, and a much greater evidence than any written words of the God in Whom he so passionately believed. In spite of all the appalling perplexities of evil, I find it harder still to think of von Hügel as a toss up. Somehow for such souls as his, one seems to need God to account for them.'

There is no space to go into von Hügel's teaching. Of religion he once said, it is not 'worth much unless it produces heroic acts.' He found seven great heroic virtues—courage, purity, compassion, humility, truthfulness, self-abandonment in the hands of God, and spiritual joy. The essence of religion lay for him not only in heroic virtue, but also in adoration. Speaking to Mrs. Cecil Chapman

on one occasion of the effort which it cost him to get his mind to work on his book, he got on to the subject of Parkman's long writing on Canadian history. He described how Parkman never spared himself. '"And yet," said the Baron, "it wasn't Religion. There was no Religion in the hard work and sacrifice."

'"What is Religion, then?" I asked.

'"Religion is Adoration," answered the Baron.

'I have thought of it ever since.'

Von Hügel was a man with a most winning personality and he had friends in all communions. But we are brought up short with a sense of dismay when we find that, sitting on the Committee in 1917 on the Army and Religion, although he could go a little further than Shylock and eat and drink with his fellow-members, he could not pray with them. 'I have carefully noted how frequent, and how fairly prolonged is going to be joint prayer at the meeting. I am, of course, *most* glad and grateful that this is so. But it has occurred to me that you might be willing—that you might possibly even like—that I should say some words—give some explanation of, or interpretation to, my abstention, not from praying for our work, nor from praying at those special times for it, but from joining in the same room with all of you. I may not do that. But I think I could say some words that would combine loyalty to Rome with other things which you would all fully like and endorse.'

Most charming of all his personal letters is a series to his niece, to whom he acted as spiritual guide. It is from one of these that we have quoted below.

The Stress of Dryness and Darkness.

'Let me give you three images, all of which have helped me on along "many a flinty furlong." At 18 I learnt from Father Raymond Hocking, that grandly interior-minded Dominican, that I certainly could, with God's grace, give myself to Him, and strive to live my life along with Him and for Him. But that this would mean winning and practising much desolation—that I would be climbing a mountain where, off and on, I might be enveloped in mist for days on end, unable to see a foot before me. Had I noticed how mountaineers climb mountains? How they have a quiet, regular short step—on the level it looks petty; but then this step they keep up, on and on as they ascend, whilst the inexperienced townsman hurries along, and soon has to stop, dead beat with the climb. That such an expert mountaineer, when the thick mists come, halts and camps out under some slight cover brought with him, quietly smoking his pipe, and moving on only when the mist has cleared away.

'Then in my thirties I utilised another image, learnt in my Jesuit Retreats. How I was taking a long journey on board ship with great storms pretty sure ahead of me; and how I must now select, and fix in my little cabin, some few but entirely appropriate things—a small trunk fixed up at one end, a chair that would keep its position, tumbler and glass that would do ditto: all this, simple, strong, and selected throughout in view of stormy weather. So would my spirituality have to be chosen and cultivated, especially in view of "dirty" weather.

'And lastly, in my forties another image helped me—they all three are in pretty frequent use still!—I am travelling on a camel across a huge desert. Windless days occur and then all is well. But hurricanes of wind will come, unforeseen, tremendous. What to do then? It is very simple, but it takes much practice to do well at all. Dismount from the camel, fall prostrate face downwards on the sand, covering your head with your cloak. And lie thus, an hour, three hours, half a day; the sand storm will go, and you will arise, and continue your journey as if nothing had happened. The old Uncle has had many, many such sand storms. How immensely useful they are!'[1]

'Blessed are they that mourn.'

'Some of your personal troubles are altogether mysterious. They have come upon you, so far as you honestly know, through no fault or transgression of your own. But, quite frankly, I know in my own case, that it is not so with the bulk of them. I can look back quite clearly to foolish things I did, neglectful things, ungenerous, mad, simply bad things, from which my abiding cares derive. At the time I did them, and afterwards, my impulse was to slur it over, to make as light of it as I could, to repress it, to push it out of mind and out of conscience. And this became a habit with me, it grew with practice. Why not?—it was the easier way, the world's way. The world said to me, "That's the sensible way; the thing's done, and there's an end on't; don't worry about it; let the dead past bury its dead!" But the world is all wrong. A voice within my heart cries out against that worldly wisdom as an accursed thing. I don't require any of the "new psychol-

[1] Baron Friedrich von Hügel, *Selected Letters, 1896–1924*, 304.

ogies" to tell me what a disease a repressed "complex," as they call it, can become. I know it. I know whenever I descend below the threshold of my heart that the great bulk of my fretfulness and wistfulness of spirit, the dispeace that eats at my mind in wakeful watches of the night, is all due to what I have described, is due to the fact that when I did that foolish, mad, or bad thing, *I did not mourn*. If only when I did the thing, in that hot fit or in that secret and graceless hour, I had faced it and gripped it by the throat and wrestled with it, and had it out in my naked conscience, and spread it out in all its ugliness before the face of God, and baptized it with the tears of my heart, and repented of it, and set about making reparations where reparations were possible, and made vows to God, and took God as my help—do I not know, as surely as I am a living soul, that I had been comforted to-day instead of being the fretted and haunted spirit that I am?'

This quotation is from a volume of 'The Scottish Layman's Library,' two other volumes of which have been reviewed this month. The title is *The Heraldry of His Disciples*, and the author, the Rev. A. Boyd Scott, M.C., D.D. It is a fair sample of Dr. Boyd Scott's suggestive treatment, and will probably make many readers turn to the little book in which he makes an effort to restore the everyday use of the fighting value of the Heraldry of His disciples. 'He would have His disciples evince in these modern days, as practically as the first disciples showed in Galilee, the signs He designed for His knightly order, when He created it. Still He calls them the Uplifted Lamp, the City Ouverte, the Crucifer, the Ready Sickle, the Sheep Sequent, and the like.' The price is only 5s. net, and the publishers are Messrs. T. & T. Clark.

Egbert Sandford.

LISTENING TO THE WIND.

God is at the Organ!
I can hear
A mighty music
Echoing, far and near.

God is at the Organ!
And its keys
Are rolling waters, storm-strewn moorlands,
Trees.
God is at the Organ!
I can hear
A mighty music
Echoing, far and near.

In a comparatively recent American Anthology, 'Listening to the Wind' was attributed to Joyce Kilmer, and we are glad to have this opportunity of pointing out that it is Mr. Sandford's work. Mr. Sandford is a careful workman who gets his effects with the minimum of words. Here are delightful little cameos. Some of the poems are faintly reminiscent of James Stephens. Many are eminently quotable. Take 'Sheep and Shepherd':

The Shepherd's work was done.
The sheep were safe
Within the fold—
Ninety-and-nine, and one.

But, he had paid the cost
Of climbing step—
Of daring flood and frost.

The sheep were safe
Within the fold;
The Shepherd? . . . He was lost.

We have quoted enough to show what Mr. Sandford's work is. No; we must quote still another:

THE HILL: CALLED NORBURY.

I seldom pass
This wind-torn tree;
Or walk this hill;
Or tread this grass.

But, I do see
Another Tree—
Another Hill—
Another Grass . . .

The title of the volume is *Poems*, and the publishers Messrs. Burns, Oates & Washbourne (5s. net).

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

We have heard on high authority that people nowadays are not worrying about their sins. The same authority would no doubt assure us that people nowadays are not worrying about the Day of Judgment. Probably the truth is that the worry which was formerly concentrated on those things is now concentrated on things essentially similar, but seen under another light or named by another name.

With the Day of Judgment, at any rate, we must all be still concerned. For, little as the theological problems of eschatology affect the man in the street, or even the man in the pew, there is one aspect of eschatology which profoundly and inevitably affects us all. Some day—and it cannot, for the longest-lived, be very far away—there will be an end of all earthly things for each of us. This world, so far as we are concerned, will pass away, and that day, when it falls across our life, will be for us in a solemn enough sense a day of judgment.

Even the least curious among us would be curious enough, in a thoughtful mood, to wonder by what standards our life shall be tried, or, in other words, what are the things that matter in the sight of God. Now Jesus has left us in no doubt as to what those things are. He has made them plain beyond cavil in His immortal Parable of the Sheep and the Goats. Certain people, He tells us, will in the end find themselves on the right hand, invited to enter upon a happy inheritance prepared for them from the foundation of the world; and certain others will find themselves on the left, with a prospect before them of desolation, pain, and sorrow. Who are those two groups of people?

The answer is disconcertingly simple. The people on the right are those who did some very ordinary things, so ordinary that they are astonished at so wonderful a reward for so simple a service; and the people on the left are those who omitted or neglected to do them. That is all. And what were those things on which, for weal or woe, so infinitely much depended? Just feeding the hungry, clothing the naked, calling upon the sick, and visiting prisoners. But these ordinary things were anything but ordinary in the eyes of Jesus; indeed, they were so extraordinary that men's attitude to them determined their eternity and their place in heaven or hell. If we do not quite use these words to-day, we must not discard with them the awful solemnity of the teaching which they embody.

Our ultimate place, He seems to say, depends on our attitude to our fellows, and more particularly to the sons and daughters of want or sorrow. Were we kind to them? That, Jesus seems to say, is all that matters. Kindness to them is kindness to Him; neglect of them is neglect of Him. In His eyes a man could not be a religious man who neglected to help the lowly or unfortunate or exploited members of society. And it gives us pause to note that, in the eyes of Jesus, the thing that sends a man to hell is not necessarily that he has been guilty of some great and shocking crime, but simply that he did *nothing*—that in this world

of countless opportunities for relieving distress he declined to relieve it. The hungry, the wretched, the poor were nothing to him; he did nothing for them, and in the end he finds himself in the outer darkness.

Our hearts tell us that, simple as this standard of judgment is, it is eminently fair. The words of Jesus have a curious but infallible way of commending themselves to our deepest conscience; and no word of His is more convincing than this. We bow before its pre-eminent reasonableness. But a whole-hearted acceptance of this standard of His would in a generation transform the face of human society.

Some months after the close of the Great War, a little German girl, poor but happy, was asked how she was being fed. 'Oh!' she quaintly replied, '*ich werde gequäkert*,' i.e. 'I am being Quakered.' What an eloquent tribute lies in this quaintly formed verb to the gracious ministrations of the Friends! She meant, 'My need is sore, I have been poor and hungry. But the Quakers heard of me, and they came to me; they fed me and cared for me, and it is well with me now.'

Doubtless the Quakers were not the only Christians who lavished their practical love upon the needy; it would indeed have been an indelible reproach to others who bear the name of Christ, had they not cared too. But it is the simple truth that the Quakers, as a body, won an imperishable place in the hearts of the needy by the swiftness and the devotedness of their response to all the manifold distress and sorrow created by the War. One who watched their work reported that 'no more intelligent and valuable relief work was being done anywhere: they were Friends indeed.'

Friends indeed—*in deed*! They were just exhibiting Christianity in practice, and Christianity is nothing unless as it affects practice, and affects it throughout. 'Every one of them out there,' another reporter of their work in Belgium wrote, was there 'actually to do things, and not to supervise some one else. They took hammers and nails and saws and built houses for people to live in. The girls baked and sewed and washed and visited the people in their homes.' The spirit of Him who said, 'I am among you as he that doth serve,' was shining through those eager but unobtrusive servants of His—shining through their radiant eyes and happy faces and through their every act of unstinting help.

Here was a religion in whose beauty and power every one was constrained to believe, for it was expressed not in creeds and formulæ, but in deeds of love. For the needy to know that they were in the hands of the Quakers was to them a source of inexpressible comfort and strength. And why should not every Christian, in just the same way, be radiating comfort and strength and help?

This is our business as Christian men. It is a thoroughly fair, but terribly revealing, test of the quality of our religion, to ask ourselves what we are doing to meet the desperate need—the hunger, the misery, the destitution, the sorrow—of which we all know only too well. It is a fair test, because it is Jesus' own test, and it is Jesus' test because it is a fair test. In His wonderful picture of the Great Judgment, as we said at the beginning, He represents the King as honouring certain people with a place at His right hand, inasmuch as they did something. Did what?—inasmuch as they gave food and clothing and shelter to those who needed them. Simple enough things these! Yet, by doing them or neglecting them, men reveal their inner quality and determine their place now and in the world to come.

In the January number of the *Holborn Review*, edited by Professor Peake, there is an article on 'The Church and the Child,' which is sufficiently bold, if not startling, to occasion some serious heart-searching among church people. We do not know the special credentials of the writer, Mr. Roland Sutton, but that does not matter. It is what he says that concerns us. His subject is one that deeply concerns the Church, and happily it is a subject that is very much before the mind

and conscience of the Church at the present time. Our own columns bear witness to the amount of serious literature that is devoted to its discussion, and there is hardly a religious body that is not giving attention to it.

Mr. SUTTON begins with a statement of the seriousness of the problem. He says that during the last half-century the Church in Great Britain has lost a million and a half scholars. About half of our children are enrolled as pupils of some Sunday school, and of these about half attend with reasonable regularity. Mr. SUTTON does not agree with the prevailing opinion that the real problem is that of the adolescent and that the real tragedy is that we are losing the adolescent. If the Church obtained the *child*, he thinks, even if it failed to keep the *youth*, the *man* would often return. The serious disaster is not that the Church is failing to retain the adolescent, but that it does not seem to be getting the child. This is one of the points on which the writer of the article holds his own view, and certainly in opposition to the view generally maintained.

As to the causes of this loss of the child, Mr. SUTTON maintains that it is due to the social and religious atmosphere by which our children have been, and are, surrounded; and he enters into an analysis of present-day conditions which will perhaps seem to readers more eloquent than sufficiently explanatory. It comes very much to this, that we are in the grip of a feverish materialism that alienates the child mind from religion, and also of a critical and rebellious spirit that kicks at all authority. Besides this, there is the legacy of the War. Years of malnutrition, lack of control, and, above all, years of war-weddings with their unfit parentage, have helped to produce the present generation. There is indeed some hope of better things, for a reaction may be traced in our modern life against a good deal of what is evil, but the facts as stated remain true.

Well, what about the Remedy? At this point the writer deals with the way in which the Church is handling the problem, and he produces his most revolutionary assertion. He thinks the Sunday school superfluous. It was started to give education, but this is now given far better in the day schools. And, as a matter of fact, the Sunday school is inefficient and bound to be so. The teaching is bad and is inevitably contrasted by the pupils with the kind of teaching they receive day by day in State schools. 'The majority of our Sunday schools are deplorable' is the writer's verdict. The buildings are ugly and inadequate. The prayers are long, boring, full of deadly iteration, and remote from child life. The lesson is 'taught' by teachers who are less efficient than their best scholars. And if this picture seems unfair to some schools it is no caricature of the average school.

What, then, should the Church do? The writer would give up the Sunday school altogether, and concentrate on teaching the child to worship. That is one thing. Another is that the Church should become the centre of *all* the child's interests, his play, his friendships, his home. These are the two positive suggestions in the article. But if the school is to be retained, the writer holds that it should be given a totally different place. It should be *first*. The Church must be prepared to spend far more money on it to make it efficient, on its buildings and organization and administration. It should be the main concern of the Church instead of being a kind of appendix to its activities.

Mr. SUTTON has written what may be regarded as an extreme indictment of the Church's methods with the young. But there is enough truth in what he says to provoke grave thought and concern. What he says of the Sunday school is largely true. He does not give enough credit to the earnest reformers in all the churches who are trying to improve matters. But it is certainly true that the churches are not taking their duty to the Sunday school seriously. No Education Authority would allow teaching to be done in conditions that prevail in the average Sunday school. And no body that realized its full duty would be satisfied with the kind of teaching that is often given. One thing at any rate is clear. If the Church is to retain the child it must set itself very seriously to make the

Sunday school a reality. The school must be made a nursery of worship and a place where the child's mind must be worthily trained in the best kind of religious knowledge. Above all, we must have the best thought in the Church given to the problem, for it is clearly the supreme task of to-day.

Professor Benjamin W. Bacon revives in his recent volume, *The Story of Jesus* (reviewed in another column), a distinction of which he has already made much, and which he owes to a lecture he once heard in Berlin from Harnack. It is the distinction between the religion *of* Jesus and the religion *about* Jesus. The former has been defined as the paternalistic theism of the Sermon on the Mount and the Lord's Prayer. The latter may be defined ast he Pauline message, that through Jesus God has been restoring the world to His favour and fellowship.

It is Bacon's conviction that Christianity, rightly regarded, is both the religion *of* Jesus and the religion *about* Jesus; and this conviction he maintains against the modern critical liberalism on the one hand and the new idealism on the other, and we sympathize with his position. For the modern critical liberalism finds in Christianity no more than the religion *of* Jesus, and the new idealism finds in it no more than the religion *about* Jesus.

On the one hand, there are those among us who maintain that the Christian ideal, properly understood, is the social ideal of religion which Jesus Himself cherished. 'Back to Jesus' is their cry; back to the man of Nazareth, to the prophet of Galilee. And when we get back to Him, and discern His doctrine as it was originally, before the enveloping mists of ecclesiastical dogma gathered around it, we shall discover that Christianity is the highest social morality lit up with the emotions or sentiments of trust in God and loyalty to Jesus.

This is a view of Christianity that appeals strongly in our modern time. We have caught afresh the enthusiasm of humanity, the feeling and emotion of human brotherliness, that glowed in the Master's heart, and many are persuaded that there is no higher end in life, and no better religion, than to labour in His spirit for the furtherance of social welfare. And in the social ideal of universal brotherhood many would find the inmost heart and core of the religion which He founded.

On the other hand, there are those among us who maintain that the Christian ideal, properly understood, is essentially a personal as distinguished from a social thing; it is that spiritual or mystical sonship with God in Christ which is righteousness, peace, and joy in the present life, and the guarantee or surety of personal survival in the life to come and of a blessed immortality. We misunderstand the true nature of our religion, it is said, if we rest upon the Jesus of history as the religious leader of the world instead of advancing with St. Paul to the conception of Jesus as the eternal Christ of God, known and adored in individual Christian experience as the soul's Redeemer and Saviour.

There is much, again, to commend to us such an interpretation of our religion. Nothing is more characteristic of Christianity than the new sense of the value of individual life which it embodies. Christ affirmed—and, indeed, it was an old Greek conviction—that there is nothing higher or greater in the universe than the individual human soul. He further affirmed—and this was even more characteristic of His teaching—that men and women are all, ideally if not as yet actually, sons and daughters of the Most High.

But any valid presentation or reconstruction of Christian doctrine must combine both these views of the Christian ideal. Christianity is not only the gospel *of* Jesus, who announced the ethical Kingdom of human brotherhood upon the earth; it is also the gospel *about* Jesus, in union with whom individual men and women may enter spiritually, even here and now, into the heavenly kingdom of Divine sonship. For Christianity is a religion both of Divine sonship and of human brotherhood in Christ Jesus; it enshrines both a personal and a social ideal.

Commentaries on the Old and New Testaments.

By Professor Arthur S. Peake, D.D., Manchester.

I.

In offering advice upon commentaries I exclude all works which are primarily devotional or homiletical. I do this not because I disdain them—indeed, I think if they are good of their kind they may be very helpful—but because my acquaintance with this type of literature is slender. Nor do I propose to touch on the older commentaries. So far as these were dominated by the allegorical method, they are of more value to students of the history of theology than to those who are concerned with reaching the actual meaning of the Biblical writers. And even where this is not the case, those for whom I am writing will be better served if they lay their exegetical foundation by study of recent commentaries written from the modern point of view and uncontrolled by the necessity of adjusting their exegesis to any scheme of theology. Jerome and Theodore, Calvin and Maldonatus, Grotius and Vitringa, to select only a few names, did a great work for the interpretation of Scripture, and it remains valuable to this day. But the field of Biblical interpretation is vast; exegesis is only one section of Biblical study; and most of my readers will have other studies to follow in the time that is left them when their primary responsibilities have been discharged.

The preacher or teacher needs the commentator in order that he may reach a full and exact interpretation of the particular passage on which he is engaged. I have perhaps no right to teach the preacher how he is to do his work; though the pew provides an angle which it is greatly to be wished that preachers might more frequently occupy. I will only say that it has occasionally been my lot to hear sermons based upon particular texts, when I have felt that there was nothing much to object to in the sermon except that it ought not to have been preached in that connexion. But, of course, no *ad hoc* exegesis can supply what the preacher needs. We recognize that a text must not be divorced from its context; but that context, again, must not be divorced from its larger context—the personality of the writer, the totality of his utterance as it has been preserved to us, the situation to which it was addressed, the people to whom he spoke. And this, again, must stand in the larger context of the whole movement of revelation. The student must therefore be continually working at the whole Biblical field, criticism, history, and, above all, the history of the religion. And all the time it is good to keep up the close continuous study of at least one section of the Bible—preferably two, one in the Old Testament and one in the New—and for this the commentary is indispensable. Here, however, I should put in a warning. I do not believe that it is ever safe for the student to limit himself to one commentary on a book, even though it should by common consent be the best. His work will also be greatly facilitated if he has an adequate linguistic equipment. I mean by this a working knowledge of the original languages and of German and French. In modern Biblical scholarship it is only bare justice to say that the Germans have done more than the rest of the world put together, and that the Biblical scholarship of our own writers has been fertilized by their labours to a quite extraordinary degree.

The day has gone for commentaries on the whole Bible by a single hand. Nor is it desirable to have a commentary on the New Testament by one scholar. It is usual for a commentary on the Bible or the New Testament to be published in a series to which a large number of scholars contribute. It is inevitable that a series should be unequal; and in this connexion another general remark which may be made is that, disregarding the inevitable exceptions, the quality of a British Commentary on the Bible is, as a rule, higher in the Old Testament than in the New Testament volumes. This is partly due to the fact that expositors are less hampered in dealing with the Hebrew Bible than with the classical documents of their own religion.

The chief commentary in English is the *International Critical Commentary*. It is written by British and American scholars. The text is not printed, but the poetical parts of the Old Testament are translated in full, and a translation of the Book of Revelation is supplied by Dr. Charles. Full introductions to the books are given. The commentary itself consists of the general exposition of the particular section followed by small-type notes dealing mainly with philological and textual points. The general standard of the series is high,

more consistently so in the Old Testament than in the New, though there are exceptions in both. The parts which have not yet appeared are Exodus, Leviticus, Joshua, Kings, Ruth and Canticles, Isaiah xxviii.–lxvi., Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Acts, and the Gospel of John, which, however, is in the press.

It is unfortunate that a number of the volumes were published so long ago that though they are still serviceable and in some cases indispensable, they no longer represent the present position of the subject. Necessarily the standpoint varies, but speaking quite generally, it is the same as that of Hastings' *Dictionary*; if two typical names might be mentioned as indicating it, Driver might be selected for the Old Testament and Sanday for the New, or perhaps one might better say Sanday down to 1912.

The *Cambridge Bible* is in course of revision. In the later instalments the commentary is adjusted to the Revised Version, and the introductions and expositions have been revised. In some cases the old commentary has been replaced by a new work by another contributor. When this process is complete we ought to have a work of sterling merit and, at least in its latest portions, fairly up to date. Unfortunately, a piecemeal revision means that some of the volumes are continually dropping behind, even though at the time of publication they may have been fully abreast of the research and interpretation of their day. There is one point in which I wish this and other series would break with tradition. It is no doubt convenient to have the text printed above the notes. But under present conditions the disadvantages are grave. It inevitably adds greatly to the cost both of printing and paper. This did not matter so much before the war; but with prices of production so much higher and with the means to purchase in many cases so seriously retrenched, circulation is inevitably restricted and preachers and teachers are less adequately equipped for their work. The other drawback is that in the case of long books so much space is occupied with the printing of the text, usually in much larger type than the notes, that the commentary has either to be too severely abbreviated or the book has to be much bulkier and dearer than it need have been. If the publishers of all the series would make up their minds to assume that every reader will keep the Revised Version open before him, and cut the text clean out, they would render a great service, especially to impecunious readers. And the contributors who in the case of the longer books are often sorely cramped for space would feel that they were able to do fuller justice to the text and to themselves. Still, we must take things as they are, and, reverting to the *Cambridge Bible*, I may say that in its more recent issues it maintains a high level. But it is greatly to be wished that where the obsolete volumes have not been replaced this should be done as speedily as possible.

With reference to the *Westminster Commentaries*, the editor, Dr. Lock, said: 'The series will be less elementary than the *Cambridge Bible for Schools*, less critical than the *International Critical Commentary*, less didactic than the *Expositor's Bible*.' For such a series there was certainly a place. But in some instances the contributor has failed to reach the editor's ideal. The most glaring example is perhaps the commentary on Ezekiel, which, although it costs 12s. 6d., is much less valuable than the far cheaper exposition in the *Cambridge Bible* or the *Century Bible*. One of the serious drawbacks in the *Westminster Commentaries* is the price; and while they contain several excellent issues, the purchaser of slender means would be in several instances equally well suited and in some better suited with the *Cambridge Bible* or the *Century Bible*, and both together might often be bought at a lower cost. It is greatly to be wished that the publishers would take this to heart. A teacher requiring a text-book for his students or recommending commentaries to preachers will not feel justified in advising purchase, though he may counsel consultation. And as compared with the *International Critical Commentary* the volumes published before the war are very much fuller and often cheaper than the corresponding volumes in the *Westminster* series if these have been published during the last ten years. There is so much good matter in some of the *Westminster* commentaries that I regret to have to point out these rather serious disadvantages.

The *Century Bible* is cheap and often very good. The volumes are published at a uniform price, and this means that the shorter books, where a whole volume is devoted to them, can be expounded much more fully. The whole of the text is printed as in the *Cambridge Bible* and the *Westminster Commentaries*; but in the New Testament a good deal of space was wasted by printing the Authorized Version of the New Testament in addition. This practice was abandoned in the Old Testament section. The character of the commentary was originally designed to be more elementary and popular; but some of the New Testament contributors lifted the standard, and this was maintained in the Old Testament, which, on the whole,

is better done than the New. At its best this series is very good indeed. The Four Gospels have been issued in revised editions.

The *Expositor's Bible* falls into a different category from any of the preceding, and for the most part it lies outside the scope of these articles. It is a very unequal series; but some of the expositions included in it will call for mention when I am speaking of the commentaries on particular books.

Of the one-volume commentaries it is perhaps better that I should not speak, as I am too closely identified with one of them to make any comment seemly. In addition to the two already before the public, two more are on the way, one for which the English Church Union is responsible (the contributors all belong to that Church); the other an American work, but international and interconfessional in the range of its contributors.

All of the commentaries of which I have spoken embrace the New as well as the Old Testament. But there are some New Testament commentaries which must be mentioned at this point. The *Expositor's Greek Testament* has scarcely perhaps been accorded its just place. This may have been partly due to the impression in some quarters that it was a revision of Alford's Greek Testament. One of the most eminent New Testament scholars in Germany, when I had explained to him what it really was, told me he had understood that it was a revised Alford and that he had not concerned himself about it in consequence. I do not know whether the same impression prevailed in Great Britain, but I have been surprised to miss references to it in bibliographies and discussions where it was certainly to be expected. Like every other composite work it is unequal; but on certain books it was better than anything we had in English. It was a bad mistake to print the Textus Receptus, as was done in the first two volumes on what the editor took to be the best advice; but I succeeded in getting the rule altered for the third and subsequent volumes, so that the contributors were allowed to construct their own text.

I need not linger on the *Cambridge Greek Testament*. In most instances the commentary is by the editor of the book in the *Cambridge Bible*; but for those who can read Greek it is much to be preferred, as the comment is based on the original text, and questions of philology, textual criticism, and the exact meaning of the words used can be much more effectively discussed than when the commentator is limited to the English text.

I might at this point call attention to Bengel's *Gnomon*. An English translation of it was made by Fausset; but those who can do so should use the Latin original. Bengel had a singular power of concise and pregnant expression, and Latin lent itself better than any other language to the lapidary quality of his style. He had deep spiritual insight, and—leaving the Apocalypse aside—he was a very sane interpreter.

I turn now to series in German. For the Old Testament, omitting Keil and Delitzsch, there are five series which may be mentioned. The first of these is the *Exegetisches Handbuch*. This was at one time the leading series, but it no longer comes out in new editions. Dillmann on the Hexateuch, Job, and Isaiah are still in use. The last of these has been rather thoroughly worked over by Kittel, and Exodus and Leviticus by Ryssel. The Commentary on Genesis has been translated into English. Dillmann was a very eminent Semitist, in particular a great authority on Ethiopic; he was also a master of the whole range of Old Testament scholarship. His commentaries are notable for their great wealth of material and the sobriety rather than piercing insight of the exegesis. So far as the criticism of the Pentateuch was concerned, while fully accepting the Four Document hypothesis, he refused to the last to admit the correctness of the Grafian view that the Priestly Code was later than Deuteronomy and Ezekiel. I need not linger to discuss other contributions to this series.

The other four series are written from the Grafian standpoint, though with a rather marked difference between the first and the second pair. They are the *Handkommentar*, edited by Nowack; the *Kurzer Handcommentar*, edited by Marti; the *Kommentar zum Alten Testament*, edited by Sellin; and *Die Schriften des Alten Testaments in Auswahl*. As to the first two, we might say that while both occupy on the whole a fairly advanced position, Nowack's series is less drastic than Marti's. Budde and Duhm contribute to both. Budde's treatment of Job in Nowack is reactionary compared with Duhm's treatment in Marti. Duhm's commentary on Isaiah in Nowack displayed a hitherto unprecedented radicalism; but Marti, while slavishly following Duhm at several points, took up a position still more extreme. Sellin represents a reaction towards a higher estimate of the early religion of Israel and the greater historical trustworthiness of our records. His own critical position may be seen from his *Introduction to the Old Testament*; but I should recommend those who desire to get a clear idea of the points at issue between Sellin and his group of scholars and those who have worked with Nowack and Marti, to

study the admirable statement contributed by Professor McFadyen to *The People and the Book*. Sellin has, in common with the band of scholars who are responsible for *Die Schriften des Alten Testaments*, the feeling that the older scholars have taken altogether too little account of the international background, the heritage of religion and culture which Israel received from Babylon and Egypt and other surrounding countries and also from Canaan itself. But Sellin writes from a more definitely religious point of view, with more stress on the element of revelation in the literature, and less on the pagan parallels.

Nowack's series is on a larger scale than Marti's, but it includes a new translation from a critically emended text. On the whole the work has been done with great thoroughness, and it contains some of the most outstanding examples of modern Old Testament exegesis, including Gunkel's *Genesis* and *Psalms*, Duhm's *Isaiah*, Budde's *Job*, and Baentsch's *Exodus*, *Leviticus*, and *Numbers*. The general standard of the series is very high; it can never be safely neglected, and in several instances it offers the best commentary available in any language.

Marti's series also maintains a high level. The contributions by Holzinger, Bertholet, Budde, and Benzinger are compact and admirable. The editor himself was responsible for *Isaiah*, the *Twelve Prophets*, and *Daniel*. They contain much valuable and solid matter, though the critical position is, as already indicated, extreme. Duhm has written on three of the most important books. His commentary on Job and considerable sections of that on Jeremiah show him at his best; his exposition of the Psalms often at his worst. As Duhm is so outstanding a figure, I may perhaps quote what I have recently written about him: 'It is easy to criticise Duhm and often impossible to agree with him. But few of our scholars have been so rich in stimulus, so original, so suggestive. As an interpreter he is at times perverse; and when his author does not enlist his sympathy, he may be both provoking and unsatisfying. Where a Biblical writer is not lucky enough to please him, he may be so occupied with scolding him for his incompetence, his bad Hebrew, his slipshod style, his odious feelings, or his objectionable ideas, that he almost forgets to expound the text he has in front of him. But where he feels himself to be in contact with a great and noble spirit, gifted in utterance, fertile in ideas, rich and deep in his religious experience, then one may expect from him a singularly fresh, sympathetic, and penetrating exposition.'

Sellin's commentary gives a translation from a critically revised text. It devotes a good deal of attention to lower and higher criticism as well as to the exposition. The volumes vary in extent and in quality; but any series would be notable which included such expositions as Volz's *Jeremiah*, Sellin's *Minor Prophets*, and Kittel's *Psalms*. A good deal of the work, however, is as yet unpublished.

Die Schriften des Alten Testaments is a valuable series. The contributors are Gunkel, Staerk, Volz, Gressmann, Hans Schmidt, and Haller. It contains a translation of a large part, though not the whole, of the Old Testament, accompanied by a continuous exposition. Unlike the series already mentioned, it is popular in its appeal and presupposes no knowledge of Hebrew.

The German New Testament series are Meyer's commentary; the *Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament*; *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*; the *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*; Zahn's *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*. Originally, H. A. W. Meyer wrote by far the larger part of his commentary, the rest being supplied by Lünemann, Huther, and Düsterdieck. In the later editions, however, the work has been done by a considerable number of scholars, and while the old name is retained the commentaries are entirely new. In several cases we already have a third exposition of a particular book which is completely new. The old *Meyer*, apart from the Apocalypse, was translated into English. Its characteristics were a very full account and discussion of the exegesis throughout the history of interpretation; great stress on the grammatical side, which was handled with excessive rigidity; and on the whole a fairly conservative critical and theological standpoint. In its more recent forms far less space is devoted to interpretations which have only an historical interest; the latest philological researches are taken into account, and the critical and theological standpoint is frequently much more advanced. Among its more notable issues I might specially single out J. Weiss's *1 Corinthians*, Haupt's *Imprisonment Epistles*, and Bousset's *Revelation of John*.

The *Handkommentar* was the work of four scholars, Holtzmann, Lipsius, Von Soden, and Schmiedel. They represented an advanced criticism, and this came to expression specially in Holtzmann's work on the Synoptists, the Acts, and the Johannine literature. It was the work of quite first-rate scholars, but as nothing fresh has been done upon it for some time it is slipping behind. The Johannine section was revised at

Holtzmann's request by Walter Bauer; and it was hoped that Schmiedel would be able to revise the work of Lipsius, but this has not been done.

J. Weiss was the first editor of *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*. His premature death in 1914 was an irreparable loss to New Testament students. The third edition was edited by Bousset and Heitmüller. The work consists of a new translation, with introductions and continuous exposition. Its standpoint is advanced. The contributors were for the most part distinguished scholars, and in spite of some weaker sections the work is first-class of its kind.

The *Handbuch* is edited by Lietzmann. It is technical rather than popular. It consists of a translation, rather paraphrastic in character in order to lighten the exegesis, and a brief, compact commentary specially strong on the philological side and supplying a rich accumulation of ethnic parallels. The standpoint is on the whole advanced.

Zahn's commentary is a massive work from the conservative side. The veteran editor has himself written the commentaries on *Matthew, Luke, John, Acts, Romans, Galatians,* and the *Apocalypse*. His collaborators include Paul Ewald, Wohlenberg, Bachmann, Riggenbach. No translation is supplied, and the form of the exposition is too solid to be prepossessing; but the work contains a large mass of valuable matter, though more than most commentaries it taxes the close attention of the student.

In French there is a comprehensive Roman Catholic commentary published in the series known as *Collection d'Études Bibliques*. The famous Semitic scholar, Lagrange, has published valuable commentaries on *Judges, Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Romans,* and *Galatians*. Condamin has edited *Isaiah* and *Jeremiah*; Hoonacker, *The Minor Prophets*; Podechard, *Ecclesiastes*; Allo, *The Apocalypse*; and Jacquier, *The Acts of the Apostles*. The enterprise has been executed, especially in its later portions, on a very large scale. It is marked by sound and sometimes distinguished scholarship and by familiarity with German and British work. It is, of course, imperative for all contributors to respect the limitations imposed on criticism by the decrees of the Biblical Commission.

(*To be continued.*)

Literature.

THE GOSPEL OF JESUS.

Dr. Benjamin W. Bacon, one of America's ablest New Testament scholars, has published eight lectures, simple in style and comprehensive in scope, on *The Story of Jesus and the Beginnings of the Church* (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net). He himself describes the work as 'a valuation of the Synoptic Record for History and for Religion.' He begins by maintaining a position on which he had insisted in a former work, that the gospel *of* Jesus cannot do without the gospel *about* Jesus, nor the gospel *about* Jesus without the gospel *of* Jesus. Following up the latter point, he insists that we want the fullest and most accurate account of the career of Jesus that historical research can give us, not merely that we may understand the mind of Jesus, but that we may understand the mind of God. No doubt the Epistles of Paul would suffice to bring us into contact with the Spirit of God as it was in Jesus, but we need every fragment of the sayings and doings of Jesus that the records can supply, in order to know what kind of Spirit we are of. As history divorced from religion lacks its ultimate solution, so religion apart from the check of history runs to superstition, goes mad.

Accordingly, Dr. Bacon attempts to get back to the earthly Jesus, and first he would sift the old Petrine tradition in its varied forms so as to come as close as possible to the primitive witness of Peter. Having tried to show how in the main the structure of Mark is historical, he proceeds to compare Mark's record with the much earlier, though meagre, references of Paul, and with the material from S, the so-called 'Second Source' of the Synoptic Gospels, used in common by Matthew and Luke (the material designated by the symbol Q). The result of the comparison is a more adequate and historical appreciation of Jesus' ministry than is afforded by Mark alone. In particular Dr. Bacon shows grounds for qualifying Mark's apocalypticism.

The closing chapter of the volume faces the question, How did the gospel *about* Jesus begin? thus seeking to penetrate the obscurity which surrounds the birth of the Resurrection-faith. It was Peter's faith in the risen Christ that was made the founda-

tion-rock of God's building; it is to Peter, through Paul, that our own line of spiritual succession goes back. With this reasonable contention Dr. Bacon concludes a volume remarkable alike for its zealous investigation of historical facts and its deep appreciation of religious values.

NATURE AND GOD.

The Rev. Professor William Fulton, until lately Professor of Systematic Theology in the University of Aberdeen, and now of Glasgow University, has published the Alexander Robertson Lectures, which he gave at Glasgow in 1926, under the title *Nature and God: An Introduction to Theistic Studies with Special Reference to the Relations of Science and Religion* (T. & T. Clark; 9s. net). The letters which follow his name, 'D.D., B.Sc.,' suggest the two lines of his studies that make his choice of subject peculiarly appropriate. Professor Fulton has been known to the wider public by his association with Dr. Moffatt in the production of 'The Expositor's Year Book'; but he has been regarded in Scotland as an able, thoughtful, and competent teacher of theology, and we have been waiting patiently for the appearance of something from his pen worthy of his reputation. This volume of apologetic amply realizes our expectations. It is amazingly learned. Nothing that bears on his subject seems to have escaped Dr. Fulton's notice. Its range of quotation is almost a minor defect, but certainly the author is not weighed down by his learning. He wears it lightly and confidently, and (what is more to the point) it never makes him dull. His style is flexible and simple, and, though he is dealing with great themes, he is always intelligible, not merely to trained minds, but to the average capacity. It is one great merit of this book that it could be read with pleasure and profit by 'the ordinary layman.'

The object of the book is to further the reconciliation of science and religion. That is one way of putting it. Perhaps it would be truer to say that it is to confirm and establish the presence of Purpose in Nature, using the word Nature in its widest sense. He has taken to heart the suggestion of a distinguished scientist that it is a mistake on the part of the theologian always to be on the defensive. When Darwin or Einstein supersedes older theories it is claimed as a triumph for science. Why should not theology make the same claim when it gives up the apologetic of the past? Dr. Fulton frankly abandons the older Paleyan contention. He admits that Kant's criticism and Darwin's discoveries have been fatal to it. But he himself takes a much broader view. He advances slowly but surely towards the concept of Purpose in Nature, and he contends that by applying the rational principle to the world of Nature we can reach God, even if it is a cold and limited theism that results. But the Purpose he finds in the universe is not the finite series of contrivances of Paley with its 'anthropomorphic theism,' but something deeper and greater, something that passes into the category of value, an end worthy of the Absolute Himself.

We have had many volumes of apologetic lately that cover the whole ground of belief. Here we have nothing of that kind. It is a limited field Dr. Fulton occupies, one part only of the nature and worth of religion. But it is a great gain to have that field thoroughly worked, and the theistic standpoint so ably vindicated. The reader will learn a great deal about the contentions of the most recent science; he will be led through a study of the developments of religious belief on this particular topic, and he will realize at the close that what the world itself yields to us is not an abstract Absolute, but a Redeeming and Sustaining Will.

CONVERSION.

The subject of conversion attracts all the writers who deal with the psychology of religion. And naturally so, for, if it contains evidence of a supernatural grace, it is the strongest of all proofs of an objective Divine Reality. The psychologist, however, refuses to admit this evidence as coming within his sphere. In this he is wise, though many psychologists who pay lip-service to this limitation actually set it at naught, and have no scruple in finding in the conclusions of psychology a disproof of religious belief. We have just received a large and important essay on the subject of religious experience from the pen of a scientist—*Religious Conversion: A Bio-Psychological Study*, by Sante de Sanctis, Professor of Psychology in the University of Rome, translated by Helen Augur (Kegan Paul; 12s. 6d. net). It is a careful survey, based on wide knowledge and long reflection. The author is acquainted with the extensive literature of the subject in all languages, and his discussion is at all points well-informed. The book will be found interesting and stimulating even by those who profoundly differ from its point of view.

The author declares his aim to be a description of the processes of conversion outside of the works of 'grace.' He investigates the genesis, establishes the relations, and in the last instance indicates the

data for the recognition and the predictability of the occurrence of religious phenomena in individuals immune from either insanity or the neuropathic diseases. He is aware that in this method he is 'up against' theologians who insist on the inscrutable prerogative of grace, and also the philosophers who defend the unpredictability of volitional behaviour. We confess to a sympathy with these two excluded classes. But Professor de Sanctis is right in delimiting his sphere of action. Psychology has nothing to do with 'grace' except so far as grace becomes an experience. The writer is justified in excluding the supernatural from his investigation. The other assertion he makes is, however, far more disputable. His psychology is deterministic, and this seems to us quite unwarrantable. Free will, however restricted, is a reality of experience, and no amount of scientific analysis will dissolve this conviction.

But in addition to this the author makes other points which are as unwarrantable. He is not content with asserting that the Personal Deity is beyond the province of psychology. Granted. He goes on to say, however, that if God the Transcendent is to be found, it must be by other than empirical methods. Such an assertion will be denied by all those who have found God in life. Indeed, the main affirmation of religious experience is just that it is in life that God is known most surely. There are other points on which readers will wish to break a lance with the Professor. Indeed, the book bristles with them. But it is a poor believer who cannot learn from so earnest and so competent an investigator as Professor de Sanctis. And when he deals with religious psychology, with conversion and its causes, with sublimation, and with the features and processes of religious life, we are constantly learning from him. The book ought to be read and pondered. We part company at many points with the learned author, but we praise him for his learning and his zeal and for the obvious sincerity with which he discusses the great issues of religious experience.

FAITH.

The Rev. D. M. Baillie, M.A., has the reputation of being one of the ablest and most scholarly of the younger ministers of the United Free Church of Scotland, and this is confirmed by his volume, *Faith in God and its Christian Consummation* (T. & T. Clark; 9s. net), being the Kerr Lectures for 1926, revised and extended. An introductory chapter on 'The Idea of Faith and its Historical Emergence,' in which Mr. Baillie makes careful use of authoritative writers, leads to the consideration in Part i. of the nature of faith, and in Part ii. of Christian faith, the whole treatment being determined by the conviction that the concept of faith requires to be maintained and elucidated if true light is to be thrown upon the nature of religion.

At the heart of religious faith—so runs Mr. Baillie's exposition—there is a quite distinctive kind of personal conviction, which cannot be reduced to 'reason' or to 'authority,' nor derived from religious experience. Indeed, faith and religious experience are essentially the same thing. Nor is the essence of faith to be identified with the 'will to believe,' though it is true that faith is somehow conditioned by the will, by the moral life, not arising *in vacuo*. The truth is that when we take our moral convictions seriously, they are found to carry with them the religious conviction that truth, goodness, and beauty are at the heart of the universe. And this religious conviction is faith in God.

Passing to Christian faith, Mr. Baillie deals with the much-canvassed problem of 'Faith and History,' holding that while Christian faith in God is dependent on the historical Jesus, it is not so in any mechanical way, but may be kindled by the Living Divine Spirit manifested in the historical Jesus. In the concluding chapter the real conviction and attitude of Christian faith are discussed, particularly in view of the problem of evil.

In developing his (not unfamiliar) positions, Mr. Baillie ranges widely in recent theological and philosophical literature, touching upon many current topics. Indeed, this constitutes the chief value of the book, which is richly informative and will prove suggestive of many lines of study, whether to the professional student or the general reader. And it is written in a non-technical style such as the general reader will easily follow. It attracts, too, by the modesty, engaging frankness, and spiritual earnestness of the writer, and by the moderation and restraint with which he states his arguments and reviews his conclusions. It is in the spirit of the late Baron von Hügel and as learning of him that he writes as follows: 'We have not succeeded in giving any very simple and definite answer to our question as to the essential purport of the claim of Christian faith, but have rather been reminded that we are here in a region in which we cannot get rid of antinomy without sacrificing depth and richness; so that the danger is that of undue simplification, of hastening to a logical simplicity in which our minds can idly rest.'

NEW TESTAMENT WORD STUDIES.

That distinguished New Testament scholar, the late Dr. Ernest DeWitt Burton, cherished the project of writing a Dictionary of the English New Testament which should do for English students, as nearly as possible, what Thayer's 'Lexicon' does for Greek students. He was prevented from carrying out his project; but an idea of the high usefulness the Dictionary would have fulfilled may be gained from the volume entitled *New Testament Word Studies* (University of Chicago Press; $2.00), which has been compiled by Mr. Harold R. Willoughby from Dr. DeWitt Burton's mimeographed sheets, and which we may justly regard both as 'a memorandum of a great scholarly project and as a contribution to New Testament lexicography.'

This collection of 'Word Studies' deals with more than a score of New Testament terms, such as repentance and forgiveness, faith, righteousness, spirit, soul, flesh, Son of Man, Son of God, Kingdom of God. The two last-named are the most elaborate of the 'Studies.' Some of the 'Studies' give, in plain English and in compact statement, a summary of materials already contained in the Appendix to the work whereby Dr. DeWitt Burton's fame is secured, namely, his 'Commentary on Galatians' in the 'International Critical Commentary.'

There is much in the articles before us that will be found helpful by the preacher or teacher. The student of Christology will take note of Dr. DeWitt Burton's observation at the close of his article on the title 'Son of God,' that in no passage of the New Testament does this term take on a clearly physical or biological sense 'implying that Jesus was by reason of exceptional facts respecting his paternity of divine nature. . . . It is always a term descriptive of the religious and ethical relationship between God and Christ.'

RELIGION IN SCOTLAND SINCE 1843.

The Rev. J. R. Fleming, D.D., was for some time General Secretary of the Presbyterian Alliance, and since his retirement from that position he has had opportunity to realize an old ambition, though he has considerably lessened its scope. His ambition was to write a history of the Scottish Church in modern times. As it is he has stopped at 1874, and though we would have wished the record prolonged through years that are familiar to many of us, perhaps the limitation was wise, as we may be too near recent events to judge them fairly. At any rate *A History of the Church in Scotland, 1843–1874* (T. & T. Clark; 9s. net), is an excellent book. It is well written and always interesting. To Scotsmen at least the period is full of momentous happenings. And the writer has a clear grasp of what was really going on under and along with these events. There are two things that are creditable to the narrator, his knowledge and his impartiality. As to the former, the book is in reality a history of Scotland during these years rather than merely of the Church. Literary influences, social forces, public events, all are set forth as they helped to shape the mind and soul of the Scottish people. And as to the latter, even in dealing with incidents where impartiality is notoriously difficult, the author contrives to do justice to personalities from whom he differs widely.

In reading these pages one is struck constantly by the fact that we are to-day living in a new world. The generation depicted in this volume was marked by the rise of separate Churches. It was an era of division, sect after sect breaking off from the Mother Church. It was notable also for its 'heresy hunts' and the fierce and passionate conflicts over doctrine and even over religious practice. And finally the Church counted for a very great deal in education. To-day all this is changed. Ours is an era of uniting. It is indifferent to heresy. Its education is secular and State-controlled. But we can see clearly how the present has grown out of the past, and how the great issue of the past, religious freedom, is still the greatest issue in our religious life.

It would be difficult to praise this book too highly. It does not fly high, but as a fascinating narrative of a period that is absorbingly interesting to all patriotic and religious Scots it will receive a warm welcome. The writer has read widely and to some purpose, and though he deals with so many different currents of fact and influence we never lose the wood in the trees.

EXCAVATIONS IN 'IRÂQ.

In *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, vol. vii. (1925–26), issued recently (Yale University Press, New Haven, U.S.A.), we have a careful and interesting report of an archæological survey made in lower 'Irâq during the first quarter of 1926 by Professor Raymond P. Dougherty, Goucher College. This particular stretch of country, lying between Babylon and Ur, and immediately east of the Euphrates, includes Warka, Tello, Nippur, Fâra (ancient Shuruppak), and other Sumerian centres. Although it has preserved hundreds of ruins of all periods, it was largely

terra incognita until lately, and comparatively few of the sites had been identified. Thanks, however, to the American Schools, the surveyors have managed by means of surface investigation and in a few cases by trial excavations to find out much of the history of various Tells, thus helping us in our efforts to determine the origin, duration, and name of each ancient centre of population, and paving the way towards a complete archæological map of 'Irâq. Examples of decorated pottery, worked flints, stamped bricks, seal impressions, and other antiquities have been obtained. A preliminary report in narrative form was published some time ago in the *Bulletin* of the Schools, but the present one describes the results of the survey in greater detail and with more mature conclusions. Not mere surface examination, however, but extensive digging will be required for the determination of the real nature of many of the sites, and this should not be impossible now that a new era in archæological work in 'Irâq has started, with favourable Government conditions for excavations. The present report should be of interest to Biblical students in presenting them with reliable facts of ancient Babylonian life and history. It contains maps and numerous illustrations.

Mr. G. F. Wates is already known as a shrewd critic of things as they are. In *All for the Golden Age* (Allen & Unwin; 4s. 6d. net) he seeks to point out the way of progress. His main idea is that 'the Golden Age cannot come through this or that panacea, but by patient and strenuous work in all directions.' He writes with vigour and earnestness, but in endeavouring to cover a wide field he becomes too discursive. Many of his criticisms are doubtless just and wholesome, but some overstep the bounds of truth and charity. It is never justifiable to accuse large bodies of men of deliberate and sustained hypocrisy. To Mr. Wates the ethical interest is supreme, but he does not attempt to show upon what sanctions his ethic rests. His hope for the future is in the emergence of a universal religion in which Christians, Confucians, Buddhists, and Positivists 'shall join with ethical societies, social workers, the man in the street, and religionists who pine for more freedom, to form the nucleus of a world-wide religion that appeals to our reason, our conscience, and our enthusiasm for humanity, and in which there is neither supernaturalism nor magic nor exclusivist assumption of special spiritual knowledge and power.' Many who are by no means obscurantist see in such eclecticism the most subtle enemy of the Christian faith to-day, the modern equivalent of second-century Gnosticism.

In 1901 Dr. Ernest DeWitt Burton and Dr. Shailer Mathews published their *Life of Christ*. A revised edition is now issued by Dr. Shailer Mathews (Cambridge University Press; 10s. net), and dedicated to the memory of Dr. DeWitt Burton, with whom he had planned again to co-operate. The most important alteration is the dividing of the work into two parts so that the first three Gospels are treated together, and then the Fourth Gospel. The latter is treated as an interpretation of Jesus, 'born of at least two generations of Christian experience.' The revision brings the book into line with the results of later New Testament research.

A popular edition of Professor Edgar J. Goodspeed's account of the writing of the New Testament, and of the collecting of the groups of books into our present New Testament, has just been published. The title is *The Formation of the New Testament* (Cambridge University Press; 5s. net).

The Rev. James Jeffrey, M.A., D.D., has published through Messrs. T. & T. Clark a little book of *Studies in the Septuagint* (1s. 6d. net), which embodies the result of his work on the Books of Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Song. Differences are noted which are due to differences between the Massoretic text and the Hebrew text on which the LXX rests, to differences arising from the confusion between similar Hebrew letters, to the Greek translators' occasional ignorance of Hebrew, etc. The book is so written that readers who are entirely ignorant of both Greek and Hebrew can follow and appreciate the argument, and the differences between the Greek and the English version with which they are familiar will not only give them many a surprise, but may perhaps lure them on to an independent study of how these things come to be.

A book of an individual character on the last days of our Lord's earthly ministry has been written by the Rev. N. Levison, B.D., whose work on the Parables was recently reviewed in these columns. It is entitled *Passiontide* (T. & T. Clark; 5s. net). The special claim of this book on readers is that it is by a Christian Jew who is familiar with the background of the story both historical and geographical. He has used his special knowledge to

purpose at many points, more particularly in his exposition of the circumstances surrounding the Last Supper. The historical background is sketched with knowledge, but it is perhaps less useful than it would have been if the sketch had been a picture. It suggests much to those who know much, but it is not full enough for those who know nothing. The writer might in a second edition give some guidance for further reading.

The book will be helpful to teachers and expositors because of the discussions of difficult points in the narrative. And this is its special contribution. The theology of the Cross and of the Resurrection at the end of the book strikes us as doubtful, but after all it is not as a theological guide Mr. Levison will assist us, and his book does not lose in value even if we disagree with some of his dicta.

'We need a definite working *philosophy* of recreation; something infinitely removed from the paganism which sets up its shrine on the golf course, or in the bull ring, or in the cinema, or on a river boat; and something equally removed from the unhealthy piety which can discern in quite natural things nothing but the stain of a Satanic imprint.' *The Christian Use of Leisure*, by the Rev. F. C. Spurr (Kingsgate Press), hardly answers to the name of a philosophy, but it contains an amount of sane Christian counsels on the right use of leisure, with special reference to sport and its parasites of betting and gambling.

A series of addresses on the Sermon on the Mount has been published by the Rev. E. L. Hamilton, with the title *The Laws and Principles of the Kingdom of Heaven* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d. net). The writer has given his life to evangelistic work for the Master, and now that he has for a time been laid aside from active preaching he has written down the addresses which have proved most helpful in his evangelistic services.

The last lectures which the late Rev. C. Silvester Horne delivered were the Yale Lectures on Preaching. They were published in 1914, soon after his death. The book has now been taken over by the Congregational Union, and the present popular edition of *The Romance of Preaching* (3s. 6d. net) may be obtained from them.

In a book on *Christ in the Hebrew Alphabet* (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d. net), suggested by the alphabetic structure of Ps 119, the Rev. John Macmillan attempts to show, by stressing the original meaning (often highly problematic) of the Hebrew letters, how full of religious suggestion, and even Christian meaning, those letters are. For example, *Aleph*, the ox, suggests strength, service, and sacrifice; *Beth*, house, suggests the importance of the home and the house of God; and so on. Despite the disclaimer in the Preface, the whole thing is thoroughly fantastic. The book, which is abundantly supplied with anecdotes, may be, as it claims, 'edifying' to a type of reader easily edified, but one will hardly look for a scholarly discussion from a writer who spells Xenophon with Z, or Lord Macaulay as MacAulay, and who imagines that 'bos' is the *Greek* word for an ox.

A book which has the rare merit in these days of being inexpensive as well as valuable is *The Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God*, by Rabbi A. Marmorstein, Ph.D., published by the Oxford University Press at 5s. net. It will be especially valuable to readers interested in Jewish speculation, the more so as 'we possess no complete work describing and analyzing, estimating or criticizing the sayings and teachings of the Jewish teachers concerning the doctrine of God'; and it is the conviction of the author that these teachings could be a practical contribution to present-day religion. He writes as one who loves as well as knows the Scribes, believing that neither Jesus nor Paul 'can reveal God in a worthier way than that paved by these Scribes.' If this will seem to Christians an extravagant claim, it is only fair to say that the familiarity of the writer with Rabbinic literature is immensely superior to that of most of those who would instinctively challenge such a statement.

A very welcome section is that dealing with the pronunciation of the Tetragrammaton, which appears to have been temporarily driven out under Hellenistic influence. Almost more interesting is the discussion of the term Elohim, in which we are informed that for four centuries this name was not used in the schools or synagogues of Palestine: the term was too general to convey the idea of God distinctive of the Hebrew people, and came to be used in reference to the idols. This, and scores of other interesting facts, occur in the section dealing with ninety-one different names of God, among which we find not only relatively familiar ones like המקום but אב שבשמים (Father in heaven), כבודו של עולם (the Glory of the World), etc. The discussion of the Rabbinic synonyms for God is followed by a discussion of the Attributes of God—Omnipresence, Omniscience, Omni-

potence, Eternity, Truth, Justice, Goodness, Purity, and Holiness—a discussion crowded with illustrative quotations and anecdotes from Rabbinic literature, which helps us to feel how penetrating was the sense of God in post-Biblical Judaism.

Dr. Benjamin B. Warfield, who was Professor of Didactic and Polemic Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Presbyterian Church at Princeton, New Jersey, from 1887 to 1921, provided in his will for the collection and publication of his numerous articles and papers on theological subjects contained in encyclopædias, reviews, and other periodicals. The first volume, containing his articles on *Revelation and Inspiration* (Oxford University Press, American Branch, New York; $3.00), has now been issued, and the succeeding volumes will contain his articles on certain Biblical doctrines, on historical theology, on perfectionism, etc. The whole series will be welcomed by many as a memorial of a learned and scholarly divine who worthily maintained the Princeton tradition in theology, and also as a potent instrument of orthodoxy in its contemporary struggle with modernism.

In the volume before us there are, besides general articles on the subjects comprised in the title, special articles on the term 'Scripture' in the New Testament, on 'God-inspired Scripture,' on 'Scripture says,' and on 'The Oracles of God.' All the articles, both general and special, reveal Dr. Warfield's distrust of modern tendencies in criticism, and his loyal adherence to traditional Protestant positions, despite doubts and difficulties. Here is a characteristic utterance: 'We believe this doctrine of the plenary inspiration of the Scriptures primarily because it is the doctrine which Christ and His apostles believed, and which they have taught us. It may sometimes seem difficult to take our stand frankly by the side of Christ and His apostles. It will always be found safe.' It is not often that Dr. Warfield unbends as in the following: 'Wherever five "advanced thinkers" assemble, at least six theories as to inspiration are likely to be ventilated.' Almost needless to add, all the articles and papers reflect Dr. Warfield's minute and massive learning.

Alive for Evermore, by the Rev. T. A. Gurney, M.A., LL.B. (R.T.S.; 7s. 6d. net), contains a series of careful and devout 'studies in the manifestations of the risen Lord.' The writer is not primarily interested in critical questions, though he shows a competent knowledge of the narratives in the original. His main object is to preach the gospel of the Resurrection. 'It is time to proclaim boldly that we are more convinced than ever, after the siftings of the historic method, that the ancient records are true; that nearly two thousand years of Christian experience carry some weight of conviction with them; that there is no other gospel that meets human need.' 'If Christ is alive at all He is King, and if He is King anywhere He is King everywhere—all fields of human life and love and labour must belong absolutely to Him.' 'It is just this dominating fact that needs to be restored, through the mind of the Church, to the mind of all humanity.'

A second edition has just appeared of one of 'The Indian Church Commentaries.' It is *The Revelation of St. John the Divine*, by the Right Rev. E. H. M. Waller, M.A., Lord Bishop of Madras. These Commentaries are specially prepared for the Indian Christian, and translations are made of them into various vernaculars. The present edition is a revised one, and takes account of Archdeacon Charles' Commentary in the 'International Critical Commentary' Series. The publishers are the S.P.C.K., and the price of the volume is 6s. net.

Mr. J. H. Oldham's *Studies in the Teaching of Jesus* has now reached its eighth edition, completing thirty-two thousand copies. The Student Christian Movement publish it in paper covers at 2s. 6d. net.

Leaders of Theological Thought.

ALBERT SCHWEITZER.

By Principal W. B. Selbie, D.D., Mansfield College, Oxford.

During a brief visit to the devastated regions of France shortly after the War, the present writer found himself with others one day in the ruined township of Günsbach, in Upper Alsace. There the party was met by the Pastor, a tall fine-looking old man, who emerged from a dug-out to welcome us with a group of school children whom he was engaged in teaching. Not till we left was it discovered that the old man was father to Albert Schweitzer, philosopher, theologian, doctor of medicine and musician. Of Günsbach and his boyhood and schooldays there and at Mülhausen Schweitzer has told us himself in a delightfully naïve and revealing little book, *Memoirs of Childhood and Youth*. Apparently he showed in his boyhood but little promise of the distinction he has since achieved. His school work was often unsatisfactory. He was a voracious but desultory reader, and his chief interests were science, history, and music. The power of application and systematic study came to him late, but, reading between the lines of his story, it is easy to discern a big nature in the making. Even as a boy he showed himself open to religious influences. He became interested in missions and was particularly sensitive to ecclesiastical art, architecture, and music. He had, too, an intense sympathy for all forms of suffering, human and animal, and quite early recognized the call to dedicate himself to the service of those in need. He writes:

'It became steadily clearer to me that I had not the inward right to take as a matter of course my happy youth, my good health, and my power of work. Out of the depths of my feeling of happiness there grew up gradually within me an understanding of the saying of Jesus that we must not treat our lives as being for ourselves alone. Whoever is spared personal pain must feel himself called to help in diminishing the pain of others. We must all carry our share of the misery which lies upon the world. Darkly and confusedly this thought worked in me, and sometimes it left me, so that I breathed freely and fancied once more that I was to become completely the lord of my own life. But the little cloud had risen above the horizon. I could, indeed, sometimes look away and lose sight of it, but it was growing nevertheless; slowly but unceasingly it grew, and at last it hid the whole sky.

'The decision was made when I was one-and-twenty. In that year, while still a student, I resolved to devote my life till I was thirty to the office of preacher, to science, and to music. If by that time I should have done what I hoped in science and music, I would take a path of immediate service as man to my fellow-men. What this path should be I counted on learning from circumstances during the interval.'

This programme Schweitzer followed out almost to the letter. He became a student and afterwards a teacher at Strasbourg University. Philosophy, Theology, and Music were the subjects to which he chiefly devoted himself. But he was not neglectful of the claims of practical religion. He became assistant pastor of the Church of St. Nicholas, and one of his tasks there was to prepare boys for confirmation. Of this work he writes: 'For ten years before I left for Africa I prepared boys in the parish of St. Nicholas for confirmation. After the War some of them came to see me and thanked me for having taught them so definitely that religion was not a formula for explaining everything. They said it had been that teaching which had kept them from discarding Christianity, whereas so many others in the trenches discarded it, not being prepared to meet the inexplicable.' This shows that even thus early he had begun to make much of the distinction between Christianity as a philosophy and as a working faith. He formulated the position at a later stage as follows: 'Christianity must, clearly and definitely, put before men the necessity of a choice between logical religion and ethical religion, and it must insist on the fact that the ethical is the highest type of spirituality, and that it alone is living spirituality. Thus Christianity shows itself as the religion which, penetrating and transcending all knowledge, reaches forward to the ethical living God, who cannot be found through contemplation of the world, but reveals Himself in man only. And it is thus that Christianity speaks with all the authority of its inherent truth.'

It was during these fruitful early years at Strasbourg that Schweitzer wrote his monumental work on Johann Sebastian Bach, by which he at once

leapt into fame in the musical world. Organ playing had become a passion with him, and he found Bach to be a kindred spirit. Away in the African forests he continued to study him, and on coming to England in 1917 gave recitals in London, Oxford, Birmingham, and elsewhere which showed him to be one of the great musicians of the world. It is not merely that he is a master of technique. He puts his whole soul into the work, and prepares for it with such devotion that playing the organ becomes an act of worship.

And with Schweitzer all this is only a parergon. His main interest during these formative years was in theology, and here, too, as a very young man he produced work which without exaggeration may be called epoch-making. In 1901 he published *Das Abend Mahl*, a study of the life of Jesus Christ in two parts, the first being confined to the Lord's Supper, and the second containing a sketch of the Life from the point of view of the Messiahship and Passion. The latter part of the book was translated into English in 1913 under the title *The Mystery of the Kingdom of God*. The whole work attracted at first but little notice. It contains, however, the material on which Schweitzer's later 'thoroughgoing eschatology' was based, and is very important for a full understanding of his position. That this young theologian had a position, and one that was well worth considering, was hardly recognized until 1906 when he issued his famous *Von Reimarus zu Wrede*, to be afterwards translated under the title *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*. This at once made a great stir, not only by the range and trenchancy of its criticism, but by the originality and even audacity of its historical reconstruction. It cut clean across the work of the liberal and religious-historical schools and proceeded to rebuild among the ruins with fresh material and on a new foundation. 'The Jesus of Nazareth who appeared as the Messiah, proclaimed the morality of the Kingdom of God, established the Kingdom of Heaven on earth, and died in order to consecrate His work—this Jesus never existed. It is a figure sketched by rationalism, enlivened by Liberalism, and dressed up by Modern Theology in the clothes of historical science.' This is not the place to criticise Schweitzer's eschatological theory in any detail. It greatly stimulated the process of *Leben Jesu Forschung*, and certainly cleared the ground of a good many prepossessions. But it has not settled anything, and is generally held to be as one-sided and extreme as some of the positions it seeks to combat. In particular his interpretation of the teaching of Jesus in terms of eschatology as an interim ethic has failed to command anything like general assent. At the same time Schweitzer's position has often been interpreted in a more negative sense than he would himself allow. He has not always been given credit for the profound religious intention underlying his work, and for his passionate desire to rescue the story of Jesus from the dogmatic trappings which have too often obscured it, and to bring it into living relations to the needs and thoughts of men. He writes: 'Jesus' deed consists in the fact that His original and profound moral nature took possession of the late-Jewish eschatology and so gives expression, in the thought material of the age, to the hope and the will which are intent upon the ethical consummation of the world. All attempts to avert one's vision from this *Weltanschauung* as a whole and to make Jesus' significance for us to consist in His revelation of the "fatherhood of God," the "brotherhood of man," and so forth, must, therefore, of necessity, lead to a narrow and peculiarly insipid conception of His religion. In reality He is an authority for us not in the sphere of knowledge, but only in the matter of the will. His destined rôle can only consist in this, that He, as a mighty spirit, quickens the motives of willing and hoping which we and our fellow-men bear within us, and brings them to such a height of intensity and clarity as we could not have attained if we were left to ourselves and did not stand under the impression of His personality, and that He thus conforms our *Weltanschauung* to His own in its very nature in spite of all the diversity of thought material and awakens in it the energies which are active in His.'

It was while Schweitzer was teaching in Strasbourg that he heard and responded to the call to more active service. Two doctor friends, missionaries in Central Africa, had died, and he was conscious of a summons to fill their place. There was a work of Christ to be done among suffering African natives, and few to do it. Why should not he? Therefore, while still a *privatdocent* in the University, he carried through a full medical course with distinction. After a post-graduate course in tropical medicine in Paris, he sailed with his devoted wife for Lambarene on the Ogowe River in French Equatorial Africa. He went out at his own charges, but was given a house and hospital by the Paris Mission Evangelique. There he did a wonderful work single-handed, paying special attention to leprosy and sleeping sickness, until it was interrupted by the War. He has told the story of it in a fascinating book, *Zwischen Wasser und Urwald* (*On the Edge of the Primæval Forest*). Here let him speak for himself. 'Lately I had a rare case to operate

on which many a famous surgeon might envy. An elderly man, living between N'Gowo and Lambarene, suddenly felt a swelling as big as your fist rising under his lowest rib, rather towards the back, accompanied by sudden pain in the body. "That is a rupture," he said to his friends. "Take me quickly to the doctor or I'm lost." They rowed the whole night and got to me about ten o'clock in the morning. I could only confirm his impression and made up my mind to perform the rarely attempted and still more rarely successful operation the same afternoon. How willingly would I have left it to an experienced surgeon! It was with trepidation that I went to work. The case exhibited all possible complications. When evening came I had not finished. For the last sutures Joseph had to hold the lamp. The next day I hardly dared go into the dormitory. I expected nothing else than to find the patient dead or dying. With hesitating steps I approached the mosquito netting. But immediately there was poked out from it a woolly head, and cheerfully grinning countenance. "Doctor, no more stomach-ache, no more stomach-ache!" At the end of a fortnight he was able to return to his village.'

'The operation is finished, and in the hardly lighted dormitory I watch for the sick man's awakening. Scarcely has he recovered consciousness when he stares about him and ejaculates again and again: "I have no more pain! I have no more pain!" . . . His hand feels for mine and will not let it go. Then I begin to tell him and the others who are in the room that it is the Lord Jesus who has told the doctor and his wife to come to the Ogowe, and that white people in Europe give them the money to live here and cure the sick negroes. Then I have to answer questions as to who these white people are, where they live, and how they know that the natives suffer so much from sickness. The African sun is shining through the coffee bushes into the dark shed, but we, black and white, sit side by side and feel that we know by experience the meaning of the words: "And all ye are brethren" (Mt 23^8). Would that my generous friends in Europe could come out here and live through one such hour!'

In 1917 Schweitzer left Africa for a time. His work had been greatly interfered with by the War. Both he and his wife were broken in health, and no more money for the hospital was forthcoming. After a period of rest he spent some time in this country and in Europe lecturing and giving organ recitals and so raising the funds needed to continue the work at Lambarene. He thus spent a few weeks at Oxford and gave the Dale Lectures at Mansfield College. These have since been published in two volumes, one entitled *The Decay and the Restoration of Civilization*, and the other *Civilization and Ethics*. Schweitzer's method in lecturing was surely unique. The lectures were written out in full in German, and delivered *ex tempore* in faultless French and with great rhetorical power and earnestness. They set forth a philosophy of civilization, wide in its historical sweep, constructive as well as critical, and full of spiritual insight. Schweitzer contends that civilization must have an ethical foundation. 'Civilization originates when men become inspired by a strong and clear determination to attain progress and consecrate themselves, as a result of this determination, to the service of life and of the world. It is only in ethics that we can find the driving force for such action, transcending as it does the limits of our own existence.' 'The future of civilization depends on our overcoming the meaninglessness and hopelessness which characterise the thoughts and convictions of men to-day, and reaching a state of fresh hope and fresh determination. We shall be capable of this, however, only when the majority of individuals discover for themselves both an ethic and a profound and steadfast attitude of world- and life-affirmation, in a theory of the universe at once convincing and based on reflection.' The two volumes referred to above are only the first half of what will ultimately be a monumental work, covering the whole range of man's community life. It represents the result of much lonely meditation in the African wilds, and perhaps it suffers from the author's lack of contact with modern conditions. He sets out on a challenging and adventurous quest and writes always with a sombre enthusiasm which compels attention and respect. 'It is my desire to be a forerunner, preparing the way for a new renaissance, and to fling my faith in a new humanity like a burning firebrand into the gloomy darkness of our times. I take courage to do so because I believe that I have succeeded in finding a basis for the disposition to act humanely, considered hitherto as merely a noble but unrelated impulse, in a world-view derived from elemental thought and capable of being comprehended by every one. Thus it possesses a convincing power which it did not enjoy previously, and is susceptible of harmonious union with actuality in an energetic and thorough manner and of becoming effective in such a union.'

During Schweitzer's stay in Europe his missionary work became better known and evoked much interest and sympathy. When the time came for him to return to Africa, though his wife was compelled to

remain behind, he was able to take with him other helpers, and re-establish his hospital work on a much larger scale. He has now a staff of two doctors and several nurses. Last year he returned home again for another furlough, part of which he intends to spend in lecturing and organ playing in order to supply the sinews of war. He hopes to visit England again in the spring. He has a thrilling story to tell of work accomplished, and we may look forward also to becoming further acquainted with the results of his meditations in philosophy and music.

It is very difficult to give any adequate impression of this many-sided man, even when he is allowed to speak mainly for himself. In appearance he is sufficiently striking; tall, dark and handsome, with thick hair and moustache, and piercing, stormful eyes. Physically he is very strong, with a powerful frame and the broad sinewy hands of a surgeon. He talks eagerly and rapidly on all kinds of subjects. While intensely interested in everything that really counts and makes for life, he is very impatient of the frills and excrescences on which so many people spend their time. Life for him is an intensely serious business, and he has no use for those who simply play with it. There is in him, too, a strong vein of humanitarianism based on an intense feeling for the sacredness of life. He has all a strong man's sympathy with suffering, and in dedicating his powers to its alleviation he has followed a deep-rooted instinct. His critical scholarship has not with him, as is so often the case with others, meant any real loss of religion. Indeed, it seems to have intensified the desire for real religious expression. This has been found, most characteristically, not in the usual channels of devotion and worship, but in a self-sacrificing dedication to the service of man. The most radical critic of the New Testament story has found in Jesus Himself something that transcends all man's thought of Him, an attractive and compelling force that alters all life's values and sums up all its duties in the command 'Follow me.' It was in response to this command that Schweitzer went out to Africa not merely that he might heal men's bodies, but also to bring to their souls something of the light and hope and peace that men can find in Jesus Christ and in Him alone. The oft-quoted words with which he closes his great book reveal the secret of his own life and work and are a challenge to all Christians: 'He comes to us as One unknown, without a name, as of old by the lakeside He came to those men who knew Him not. He speaks to us the same word: "Follow thou me!" and sets us to the task which He has to fulfil for our time. He commands. And to those who obey Him, whether they be wise or simple, He will reveal Himself in the toils, the conflicts, the sufferings, which they shall pass through in His fellowship, and, as an ineffable mystery, they shall learn in their own experience Who He is.'

The Shepherd of Hermas in the West.

By J. Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D., D.D., Birmingham.

It is more than thirty years since I published a tract under the title *Hermas in Arcadia*, with the object of showing that the scenery described in one of the *Similitudes* of Hermas was genuine Arcadian scenery, reminiscent no doubt of the native land from which Hermas and his brother Pius had been exported by the trainer who reared them for the Roman slave market. At the present time there appears to be a revival of interest in Hermas in various quarters; it began, perhaps, with his Christology, under the lead of Professor Kirsopp Lake; it has been accentuated by the suggestion of possible connexions with the so-called Hermetic literature on the one hand, and by the recovery on the other hand of further fragments of the Greek text in papyri. I now propose to make a trifling contribution to the history of the Latin Hermas in Western Europe, and, surprising as it may sound, in Britain itself.

Although Hermas is, properly speaking, a Greek Father, by origin and education, and belongs to the Roman Church at a time when it was still more Greek than Latin, there is no doubt that the Latin translation of his works had a wide circulation. There are two versions, one existing in many copies, the other in a single copy, known as the Palatine Version, and believed to be a product of some church or school in Southern Gaul. Apart from actual texts or quotations from such, there are a number of natural references to the *Shepherd*, on

the part of scholars who were interested in the subject of the Canon of Scripture or related matters. I do not, however, remember to have seen it noted that any Western or British writer betrays a close acquaintance with the matter of Hermas as distinct from his canonical position or authority; and it was with special pleasure that I detected a case of undoubted acquaintance with Hermas' writings in the British Isles. It was in the story of St. Kentigern, the patron saint of Glasgow, whom I am bound on private grounds to revere, and which is a splendid hunting-ground for the folk-lorist, that I came upon the following incident.

St. Kentigern (St. Mungo, in popular speech) was paying a visit to a king of North Wales, whose name was Morken (*i.e.* Morgan). From Morgan, who was very rich, he solicited aid for his starving monks. Morgan chaffed him, told him to cast his burden on the Lord and He would sustain him, and in many ways reviled the saint and his religion. Kentigern explained to him from scripture and appropriate examples that it was true that righteous men were often tried with poverty, while bad men were allowed to revel in wealth. He explained to him the nature of the mutual help between poor and rich, using as an illustration the vine that finds its support in the elm. This is one of the best known of the *Similitudes* of Hermas. It opens as follows:

> 'As I walked in the field, and noticed an elm and a vine, and was distinguishing them and their fruits, the shepherd appeared to me, and saith, "What art thou meditating within thyself?" "I am thinking, Sir," said I, "about the elm and the vine, that they are excellently suited the one to the other."'

The explanation is then made that the union of elm and vine is a parable of the like interdependence of rich and poor.

If we turn to the text of the Life of St. Kentigern in Capgrave's *Nova Legenda Angliae*, we find that Kentigern explains to Morgan as follows:

> Pauperes vero divitibus patronos fore, quorum beneficiis sustentantur, divitesque pauperum patrocinio, sicut vites ulmi sustentaculo, indigere, evidenter edocuit.
>
> (Capgrave: ed. Horstmann, ii. 120.)

Our first thought, on reading this passage, is that the author of the story has suffered some displacement of clauses; for he seems to make the rich man the vine, and the poor man the elm. Indeed, I should have expected that any one reading the Parable in Hermas would say that it is and must be the Rich Man who supports the Poor Man, and is Elm to his Vine. But do not let us be hasty to alter the text. Let us look at the passage in Hermas more carefully. He tells us that:

> 'The vine, when hanging on the elm, bears its fruit in abundance, and in good condition; but when spread on the ground, it beareth little fruit and that rotten.'

Here the suggestion is made that riches, kept to themselves, are unsatisfactory: they are meagre and unproductive. They need the support furnished by charity and the consequent intercessions of the faithful. Hermas says further:

> 'The rich man goeth up to the poor, and assisteth him in his needs, believing that for what he did to the poor, he shall receive a reward from God. In the sight of men, then, the elm seemeth not to bear fruit, and they know not, neither perceive, that if there cometh a drought, the elm having water nurtureth the vine, and the vine having a constant supply of water beareth the fruit twofold, both for itself and the elm. So likewise the poor, by interceding with the Lord for the rich, establish their riches.'

Clearly Hermas has equated the poor man with the protecting and sustaining elm, and the rich man with the clinging and supported vine. But this is the same explanation which we found in the story of St. Kentigern. We do not need to alter the text, nor need we have the least doubt that the author of the life of St. Kentigern was acquainted with the text of the *Shepherd* of Hermas. Even in a mass of legend and folk-lore there are some pearls to be found.

But now let us cast our critical net a little wider, to see whether there is any further acquaintance of early writers with the Parable of the Elm and the Vine.

When Origen was making his commentary on the Old Testament, he came to the Book of Joshua, and to the story of the Gibeonites and the trick which they played on the Israelite captain. The reader will remember that they came from a far country (so they said), so far off that they wore themselves threadbare on the journey, with shoes to match. Joshua honoured the treaty into which he had been beguiled, but reduced the Gibeonites to everlasting servitude as hewers of wood and drawers of water to the congregation of Israel. Origen says that the relation between the contracting parties was like

that of the Vine and the Elm in the Parable of Hermas. What does he mean? Are the Gibeonites the Vine and Israel the Elm to which they cling, or is it the converse? We should expect, at the first glance, that it is Israel that has taken Gibeon under its protection, but let us see what Origen actually says:

> 'Hermas tells us in the little book called the *Shepherd*, that there is a certain tree called the elm, which bears no fruit, but carries the vine, which bears abundant fruit; and from the fact that it serves as a support to the vine . . . even the elm, which is unfruitful, appears to be necessary and useful from the service which it renders to the fruitful vine. Something of this kind occurs in the case of the Gibeonites, who, though they have not put off the old man and his deeds (a neat allegorical touch from the old boots!), yet minister to the saints and serve them.'

So they had a second-hand salvation in the covenant of Joshua, who is allegorically Jesus.

It is clear from the foregoing that Origen has treated the Gibeonites as the Elm, and the Israelites as the Vine. Perhaps he was led to his allegorical parallel by the statement of Hermas that the Elm supplies water to the Vine, *i.e.* to Israel. In that case has not Origen inverted the parallel? In Hermas the Saints are the elm, and the Rich those who are hardly saved. The inversion was perhaps natural, in making Allegory out of Allegory.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

Professor Rade now completes his Christian Theology,[1] devoting his third book to a variety of topics all capable of being comprised under the general title 'The Spirit.' He seeks to give 'inward' theology, such as will make his readers more familiar with the gospel—the one thing needful. Like most recent writers on the subject, Rade is more interested in the influence of the Spirit, as a Divine saving agency, than in questions of ontology. The Spirit is the redeeming presence of God in human life, the blessed immanence of the Transcendent One. As Luther did, we should keep the Spirit and faith vitally one. If we do, there is no reason why we should not speak of the *unio mystica*, that phrase of many vicissitudes. In this section some excellent remarks are bestowed on Barth's description of faith as a 'vacuity,' which elaborately misses the point that faith is spiritual fulness itself.

Like all Lutherans, Rade is resolved to have Luther on his side—a praiseworthy ambition. But the accumulation of passages from the Reformer on certain themes is overdone: 'the Word' is an example. Yet it is conceded that Luther's influence too often led to Biblical dicta being put above the Spirit. The rise and fall of the doctrine of verbal inspiration is treated at considerable length. Its surrender means the breakdown of traditional orthodoxy.

Rade can differ from Luther as well as agree with him. He points out that while in the Reformer's earlier period the eucharistic gift or *res* was the forgiveness of sins, later in controversies with the Swiss it became the Real Presence, unspiritually conceived. It is interesting to find that Luther gives no place to the conception of 'the Church invisible'; for him visibility was essential, but a kind of visibility which has God for its source. Rade calls attention to a startling blank in the older theology—it had no chapter on prayer! In prayer, as he rightly says, 'adoration' is the first and principal thing. The Spirit can never be understood if we fail to inquire where lies the support and inspiration of the Church's prayer-life.

Justification is given its merited place. Luther's great revolutionizing thought, that justification regenerates, was wholly abandoned, and it came to be taught that since God's justifying act takes place outside of a man, it cannot change him inwardly. Whereas, in fact, the believer is a new man, ready furnished by his fellowship with God for good works. Justification is a creative thing, the wonder of wonders wrought by God. We must not relegate miracle solely to Scripture, as older thinkers did; for the roots of faith in miracle lie,

[1] *Glaubenslehre:* iii. 'Vom Geist,' von Martin Rade (L. Klotz Verlag, Gotha; 1927. M.8).

permanently, in our actual religious experience. This section on miracle is one of Rade's best; faith not only experiences miracles, it does them. Certainly he has the great missionaries on his side.

We cannot dwell on the eschatology. We ought to think less of the *end* of things, Rade pleads convincingly, and think more of their *goal*. The only dogma concerning death which it befits Christian men to hold is that 'death is swallowed up in victory.' Throughout the book Rade's favourite thought, that we cannot have God without having our neighbour too, recurs from time to time, and here he applies it to the life eternal. The members of the Father's family possess each other for ever.

Challenges to the Christian public opinion of the day are not infrequent, as when he urges that Luther was no quietist, or speaks sound words on the religious value of civilization. But not all of Rade's modernisms are acceptable. There is a really puzzling passage on p. 240, where he seems ready to interpret the inward, private character of faith by referring it to the subconscious. Surely it is by its appeal to the conscious spirit that the gospel of Jesus does its characteristic work, and only so.

It must be a satisfaction to this brave and able leader of Christian thought to have completed so substantial and living a contribution to the explanation of Christian religion. The world owed him something, and now its debt is all the heavier.

As an introduction to anti-Barthian polemic, this book[1] may be recommended warmly and with only minor qualifications. It is written with the simplicity and fire of a preacher, also with something of his diffuseness. Barth himself is allowed to speak, virtually every important position being carefully documented. Like other critics of Barth, Dörries is occasionally hampered by the former's tendency to follow up startling negations by softer positives which leave us wondering what the upshot of the whole is. Barth himself is a preacher in temperament, and a preacher of immense force, whose thundering protest against utilitarian religion has carried far and wide. But he gives us disappointingly little help in thinking out Christianity.

Dörries feels that Barth has constructed a theology of the trenches. His pages are full of high explosive. If we take his main tenets one by one we can see how provocative they are, and how difficult, in their extreme one-sidedness, to reconcile with a truly Christlike thought of God. He teaches that God always comes to men through terrors of conscience, and naturally speaks seldom of God as 'Father.' Human faith is, and ought to be, mere 'emptiness,' and all assurance is presumption. His view of the world is all but Manichean. In virtue of his annihilating estimate of everything human and historical, Barth makes the sharpest distinction—virtually Gnostic—between the historic Jesus and the supra-historic Christ. It looks as if this were separated only by the narrowest margin from a denial of the historicity of Jesus, His cross and resurrection turned into mythical symbols. To practical and civic life Barth's attitude is almost purely negative, and he can describe the family as 'the worm-eaten idol of the bourgeoisie.' We can do nothing to hasten the coming of the Kingdom of God; the chiliasts are right.

'Our Nay is deeper than our Yea,' says Barth in a typical utterance; but Dörries will carry most people with him in his contention that Ro 8 is the direct repudiation of this. The God whom Jesus brings and reveals is not far off; He is both far off and near, and it is the very heart of the gospel that the Holy One has made Himself ours in grace. Barth seems bent on making men afraid of God. All honour to his hatred of man-centred religion and his warning cry that man, by himself, is nothing. But then Jesus has enabled us to believe that man is never wholly 'by himself.' There is a living God, who seeks and finds His children perpetually.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Edinburgh.

Professor Budde[2] regards 6^1–9^6 in the Book of Isaiah as a separate booklet, a memoir written by Isaiah for the guidance of his followers. In it the prophet related the story of his call and of his experience with King Ahaz. He then developed at some length his message to the court and his expectation about the future of Judah.

Apparently Isaiah anticipated a severe and well-merited chastisement carried out by Assyria, which Yahweh was to use as His instrument. Taught by this bitter experience, a remnant was to repent of its sin. When they repented, they should find courage to resist their oppressor and full support from their God. Under a deliverer, the child who was already born, they should be able to expel the invader and restore the ancient kingdom of David, which should then become

[1] *Der ferne und der nahe Gott*, von Bernhard Dörries (L. Klotz Verlag, Gotha; 1927. M.4).

[2] *Jesaia's Erleben*, von Karl Budde (L. Klotz Verlag, Gotha. M.5).

unending. Unfortunately we are not told by the Professor what constituted Ahaz's guilt in this interpretation. Ought he to have resisted Assyria in order to bring on the chastisement, or to have joined the league of Damascus and Samaria for the same purpose?

It will be observed that the interpretation runs along the older lines. Budde will have nothing to do with eschatological ideas in the prophets. What Isaiah anticipated was a purely national kingdom, and what prompted him was a political interest. The child who was born was probably Hezekiah, in whom the prophets foresaw a forerunner of Judas Maccabæus. Immanuel was no individual, but the representative of the new generation which repented under chastisement and was endowed with power to set up the old Davidic kingdom. The young woman who is his mother was any young woman of the time. Incidentally it may be noted that here 'young woman' with the article means in Hebrew usage any young woman, but 'sanctuary' in Deuteronomy with the article can only mean the specific sanctuary at Jerusalem. So greatly do circumstances alter exegesis.

The Professor writes with his usual clearness, vigour, and lack of hesitation. And he writes from a full mind. Occasionally, however, one could desire a little more hesitation in view of the proof which is offered for a position.

Thus, because Budde believes the little memoir to be a well-connected whole, he has no patience with those modern students who see the prophetic writings to be largely made up of short oracles. Yet it may be questioned whether it helps much to write about them in these terms: 'to break up the connection, to leave at the beginning the fragment of an enigmatic prophecy, followed by a series of fragments which hang in the air without connection with each other is merely arbitrary and is simply the result of insufficient understanding and false interpretation.' The students who are compelled to regard the conclusion of chap. 7 as made up of a series of brief oracles may be worms, but they have something quite real to offer in support of their position. ADAM C. WELCH.

Edinburgh.

Instead of offering a longer review of one or two foreign books, I am here submitting a brief survey of publications which have come under my notice in recent months. Indications may be found of the movements of thought and life in Germany from the periodical literature. Despite the efforts of some English disciples, the philosophy of Eucken has not exercised any great influence in Britain. In Germany there exists the *Euckenbund*, the *Mitteilungen* of which are sent to me regularly, and which show how greatly his memory is cherished and how diligently his influence is maintained. In the *Tatwelt*[1] the circle of his disciples deals with the questions of the hour in his spirit and with frequent reference to his teaching. One could almost speak of a cult of the Great Master. The same tendency to link thought with life marks the journal, *Philosophie und Leben*,[2] of which the motto is: 'In the service of national unity our paper endeavours to deal objectively with the different tendencies in world-views.' Similar in tendency, but probably with a still more practical and an international outlook, is the newly begun journal, *Geist und Wahrheit*.[3] The monthly with which the name of the well-known Dr. Siegmund-Schultze is connected has expanded into a large quarterly, and seeks to promote social and international co-operation. Its name is *Die Eiche*.[4] The German Churches are increasingly turning their attention to the social problems; and the freedom from State control, which they now enjoy, allows them to do so more than formerly. Two publications represent this interest. *Kirchlich-soziale Blätter*,[5] represents the more official attitude of the Churches, and continues the movement of Stöcker. The quarterly *Evangelisch-sozial*[6] is more progressive, and continues the work of Naumann. An excellent organ for Pastoral Theology is *Pastoralblätter*,[7] edited by Dr. Erich Stange, which welcomes contributions from other countries regarding the life and work of the Churches. The movement for Christian unity, with a High Church tendency, is represented by *Una Sancta, ein Ruf an die Christenheit*;[8] it has hitherto had Roman Catholic collaborators; but the last number contains an announcement that they have been prohibited from further co-operation; and it is understood that this will bring this publication to an end. Dr. Karl Beth of Vienna has started an institute of Psychological Research, and in connexion with it there is being published a quarterly, *Religionspsychologie*.[9] Among the contributors are Principal Selbie and Professor Thouless.

[1] Euckenbund, Jena, Botzstrasse, 5.
[2] Felix Meiner, Leipzig.
[3] Ambrosius Czako, Wien. [4] Kaiser, Herrnhut.
[5] Stockerhaus, Berlin.
[6] Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen.
[7] Ungelenk, Leipzig.
[8] Frommans, Stuttgart. [9] Braumüller, Wien.

Dr. Adolf Keller, who knows the Churches of the Continent, Great Britain, and America as few others do, has provided a very useful brief summary of opinion and action among the Churches, under the title *Die Kirchen, und der Friede, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung ihrer Stellung zum Völkerbund*[1] (the Churches and Peace with special reference to their attitude to the League of Nations). He also contributes to the composite work appearing in parts, *Der Protestantismus der Gegenwart*,[2] the article on American Protestantism, a most capable survey. The Lausanne Conference has received more attention in other countries than Great Britain. Dr. Cajus Fabricius of Berlin, who is engaged in founding a central bureau of research regarding creeds, and for intercourse among the communions, has prepared for that Conference an *Oekumenisches Handbuch der christlichen Kirchen*,[3] the German text of which lies before me, but which has been translated into English. It is an astonishingly compact and adequate survey, characterized by German thoroughness in the material and its arrangement. The contribution which Dr. K. L. Schmidt made to the volume presented to Dr. Deissmann on his sixtieth birthday carries us back to the fountain-head of these many streams, as it gives a lexicographic and biblical-theological study of the primitive Church—*Die Kirche des Urchristentums*.[4] This learned monograph discusses the use of the word 'ecclesia' with reference to Hebrew and Aramaic equivalents, the authenticity of the saying of Jesus regarding the Church in Mt 16^{18}, and the relation of Paul and Peter, or Gentile and Jewish Christianity, in their bearing on the claims of Catholicism and the Protestant challenge. It is full of valuable material.

We return to the Church of to-day in a book by Dr. Otto Dibelius, *Das Jahrhundert der Kirche*,[5] which shows that under such leadership as is here offered, the Church in Germany, delivered from its subjection to the State, conscious of its urgent opportunity and imperative obligation, inspired by a large and lofty ideal of what the Church should be, sustained in its efforts by closer association, and fuller understanding of the Churches of other lands, may yet recover its proper place in Germany, and lead and help it towards the realization of the Kingdom of God, as no other movement, because lacking the dynamic and the guidance, can. The volume is divided into four sections: the book of history, the book of observation, the book of survey, and the book of aims. A comprehensive and discerning look is cast backwards, inwards, outwards, and forwards to show how this century of opportunity and obligation for the Church may be made the century of aspiration and achievement, triumph through test and trial. This is one of the most interesting and inspiring books which I have read for a long time. It is to be hoped that by such efforts the Church of Germany will overcome the hostility which marks one of the Youth Movements under the leadership of Leonard Nelson, whose death took place while this notice was being written.

Nelson was a Professor of Philosophy in Göttingen, in the succession of Kant und Fries; he has written two large works: *Kritik der Practischen Vernunft*, in which he seeks to define the supreme principle of ethics, and *System der philosophischen Rechtslehre und Politik*,[6] in which he applies his ethics to politics. His Youth Movement, which includes many devoted disciples, is opposed both to the Social Democratic Party, and to the Church, because of its identification too closely with existing social order. He has issued a number of pamphlets under the main title *Oeffentliches Leben*, the purpose of which briefly is the advocacy of the training of cultured youth for leadership in public life. This purpose he sets over against the aims and ways of Social Democracy in Germany, and generally, in the pamphlet, *Demokratie und Führerschaft*.[7] In this second edition the pamphlet occupies some twenty-eight pages, and the four appendices a hundred and forty. In this he defends his thesis that the State of Justice cannot be reached under democracy, as the rule of the majority, against the advocates of democracy as the best form of government, and consequently critics of his position. There is not a little repetition; but the volume has interest in bringing the reader into the full current of political thought in Germany to-day. The writer seems to be a 'bonny fechter,' and ever ready to return blow for blow.

Turning from Germany to France, I have been much impressed by a volume of sermons by Dr. Wilfred Monod, entitled *Notre Culte*.[8] Five of the sermons deal with the worship of the Church, bringing out the significance of its different parts (the invocation, the creed, the sacrament of silence, the collection, the benediction). One deals with the Stockholm Conference as a movement towards

[1] Furche-Verlag, Berlin.
[2] Bohnenberger, Stuttgart.
[3] Evangelischer Pressverband, Berlin-Steglitz.
[4] Mohr, Tübingen.
[5] Furche-Verlag, Berlin.
[6] Verlag 'der Neue Geist,' Leipzig.
[7] Verlag 'Oeffentliches Leben,' Stuttgart.
[8] Librairie Fischbacher, Paris.

Christian Unity, and another with the League of Nations. A third is an appeal for the work of evangelization to which French Protestantism is called by its position. The first and the last sermons go together: mankind as the family of Christ (Sermon i.) is charged (Sermon x.) with the duty of not ignoring the common creaturehood with the lower animals. This is a most moving protest against all cruelty to the lower animals. In these sermons Liberal French Protestantism is seen at its very best.

One of Dr. Monod's works, *Vers Dieu*, instruction for catechumens, has been translated into English, and will shortly be published by A. & C. Black.

This brief survey may serve as a call to fuller knowledge, clearer understanding, and closer co-operation with Continental Protestantism.

London. ALFRED E. GARVIE.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Rubs and their Reasons.

BY THE REVEREND STUART ROBERTSON, M.A.
GLASGOW.

'I was at ease, but he hath broken me.'—Job 16[12].

I HAVE a little friend called Pristina. No: not *Chris*tina. Look again—*Pris*tina. Pristina is very little and very neat and has some funny ways. Pristina sometimes plays a little trick on me: it is the trick of shamming dead.

I have seen children play a trick like it. They didn't sham dead, but they shammed deaf. They didn't hear when they were called, because they didn't want to hear. They were playing in the garden, and when they were called they were afraid that it was to go a message or to come to their lessons. So they shammed deaf. Sometimes in the morning, when they were called to get up, they shammed being asleep. Grown-up people do it too! A lady rang three times for her maid, and when at last the maid came her mistress asked, 'Didn't you hear the bell?' She answered, 'I only heard it the third time.' The first two times she was shamming deaf. It's wonderful what people 'don't hear' in church. So we have a proverb in Scotland, 'There's nane sae deaf as them that winna hear.'

But Pristina does worse. She shams dead. It seems as if she were dead.

There are several creatures that do that. Pick up certain spiders, or beetles, and they draw up their limbs and remain quite motionless, to all appearance dead. Lay them down on the ground again, and off they scuttle, very much alive. It looks like a very clever trick, and we say they are 'shamming dead.' But, it seems now, it isn't that at all. They are not the artful dodgers we thought they were. By picking them up we have upset their life. We have taken them away from the things which keep them awake. They need the touch of the roughnesses of the earth to keep them alert and moving. When we take them away from them a sort of paralysis comes on them. They seem dead, but they aren't; and they aren't shamming. It is a darkness, a sluggishness, a sort of stiff cramp that comes over them.

That is what happens to Pristina when she 'shams dead.' She is a little fresh-water worm, and it seems that if you only keep her from touching anything rough, you send her into a queer death-like sleep. Even a few grains of sand are enough to keep her going.

Now, I think Pristina is not only an acquaintance, but a relation: in fact, you and I *are* Pristina! We would like life to be smooth and soft and easy. We think it isn't fair that there should be rough, hard things that hurt: grains of sand that fret us, gravel that gets into our shoes and makes us limp with sore feet, rocks which bruise; and other things that fret our tempers, and rub our heart and soul and conscience—sorrows, temptations, trials, difficulties.

We say, 'Why should good things all be difficult? Why should life be full of rubs? Does God love us? Does He care? If He did, would these things be there?'

Yes! He does; and it's these very things that show it. If life was smooth and easy, our souls would fall asleep. A stiff cramp would come upon them. So Jesus says, 'In this world ye shall have

tribulation,' and 'tribulation' means exactly and precisely 'rubs.' When life is easy, the sun always shining, the wind always warm, food abundant and little or no need for work, as in some of the sun-bathed islands of the Southern Seas, the people have never grown up. Their minds are asleep, their souls are unawakened. They are just big children, lazy, passionate, thoughtless, unable to look ahead. Where life is harder, they are a finer folk. Think only of two little countries. One is Holland, where always they have to fight the sea for their life and land, and where they had for long to fight the Spaniards and the cruel Inquisition for their liberty and their faith. Holland has played a fine part in the world and has given high examples of brave manhood and womanhood. The other is Scotland, where the people have had to fight against a hard climate, and between times they had to fight the English to keep their freedom, and persecutors to keep their religion. Scotland has done great things and given great men and women to the world. Sir Walter Scott calls her 'Caledonia, stern and wild,' and then he says she is 'meet nurse for a poetic child.' She has been 'meet nurse' of much greatness, for flabby nurses make flabby children. No two nations have done more for freedom of land and freedom of conscience than these two little nations.

When God wanted to make His people into a nation, He took them into the desert, over sand and rock, through danger and weariness, and by many a sore rub made them into men.

We talk of a man having 'grit' in him. It is the grit in the world that is our chance of getting 'grit' into our character. So a great and wise poet has written:

> Then, welcome each rebuff
> That turns earth's smoothness rough,

and St. Paul says to Timothy 'endure hardness.'

We would like to be kept from touching anything rough. We would like a father that does everything for us and fights all our battles. I'm sorry for a boy with such a father, for he'll never grow up into a real man.

Certainly, we haven't such a Heavenly Father. We have One who loves us too well to make our life so smooth that we just fall asleep and get stiff cramp in our souls. Too much comfort has killed more souls than sin. It has just paralysed them and sent them asleep. It was when Peter was warming his hands at a fire that he denied his Lord. It is because they are difficult that we know what are the best things, and it is by the rubs of life that our souls are kept awake and have their chance to grow.

Knowing Eyes.

By the Reverend R. Strong, M.A., B.Litt., Norwich.

'Having the eyes of your heart enlightened.'—Eph 1^{18}.

One summer's day, when the boys were discussing what game they should play, somebody said, 'Let's play Jack the Giant-Killer.' And when they had settled the very awkward questions as to who should be Jack, and who was to be the Giant, and what part the rest should play in the game, you may be sure they had rather an exciting time. When they told mother about it at night, they were a little surprised when she said, in that quiet way of hers that means so much, 'Yes, that's a great game, and one you will still be playing when you have grown quite big—it may be a dangerous game later on, and I hope Jack will always win.' They said, 'But won't Jack always win, Mother?' to which mother replied, 'Sometimes the giant has been known to win, so we must learn to tackle him.' How to beat the giant becomes a big thing we have to try to learn, and it is just as well to begin learning soon. There was a poet who once told us part of the secret, and this is what he said:

> giants to slay
> Demand knowing eyes in your Jack.

Like many other people who have thought a good deal about life, George Meredith had thought about this serious task of killing giants, and this is what he had decided, that if you were going to have any success you would need very open eyes, that indeed, as the New Testament says, you must have the eyes of your mind enlightened. Meredith sometimes used to say things in a funny, twisted sort of way, but for the most part it was worth while to have patience to untie the knots. Here he wants to tell us all that it is not enough for Jack to make up his mind to be a giant-killer. That is a part of the story; but then he must get his eyes opened so that he can recognize the giant when he sees him. That is easy enough in the story-books, and anybody can draw some pictures showing what he thinks the giant ought to look like. You could draw everything on a very big scale—big hands, big head, big boots—so that even the baby would know you meant it to be a giant. In real

life, however, giants are not at all like the drawings you make, and those who are the most difficult to fight and overcome seem to know some strange tricks, and they know all manner of strange disguises. You see they would be beaten as easily as possible, if they came out into the world looking like the giants of the picture-books, and you may be sure they don't intend to be beaten if they can help it. The fact is some of them know how to make themselves look quite nice, and Jack—that is to say, you—will need very open eyes to have any luck in the encounter.

Here, for example, is one of the worst of them. His real name is 'Indolence,' but he never uses this name in talking to you, because he is afraid he wouldn't have much influence over you if he did. He thinks, rightly enough, that if he used that name you might soon send him about his business, so the name he uses oftener than any other is Mr. Good-Time. Of course, he has no right to that name, but this giant is not a nice fellow in anything he does, and I'm afraid he doesn't worry about stealing a name from somebody else. He has a way of coming along when some new tasks have to be done and talking in the most pleasant way. If ever you have a problem to solve which looks difficult, just because it happens to be strange, you can hear his smooth voice saying, 'Why do you want to worry about that, old man? Don't you see how strange it all is? What's the good of spending your time on that funny-looking problem in Algebra, which you may get all wrong? Give the thing up and have a good time with me. Don't do anything; let the others get on with it.' I wonder if Jack will recognize whose voice is speaking when he hears words like these. If he does, then there is a chance that he will score one of the great victories of his life, a victory which is going to save him for many a splendid bit of service later on. But if he doesn't see that this is the giant to be slain, a fair share of his life may be spoiled. This particular giant is a terrific taskmaster, and he is going to keep Jack out of all the fun and adventure and service of life. The truth one needs to remember is that this giant will not have a ghost of a chance of victory so long as Jack finds something to do, and loves the work with all his heart and soul. It is the empty mind that giant Indolence conquers so easily—the Jack who is doing his task with all his mind has already won his victory. All through life let us learn to pray for the opened eyes that we may recognize the horror of this monster, lest he come and enslave us.

The Christian Year.

Third Sunday in Lent.

The Favour of Man.

'Joseph found grace in his sight, and he served him. . . . The Lord gave him favour in the sight of the keeper of the prison.'—Gn $39^{4.\ 21}$.

The character of Joseph as depicted in Genesis is one of the finest in literature—a rare combination of strength and sweetness, wisdom and humility, with the strength of a soldier and the grace of a courtier. Gifted with such a happy temperament that in adversity he was able to face misfortune with a bright cheerfulness and a half-humorous buoyancy, he was also of such a winsome nature that in prosperity he never grew arrogant or selfish. Added to the flexibility and grace of his character, there were strong self-control and probity that nothing could undermine.

There are three chief reasons which help to explain the force of influence such as Joseph's, and which at the same time reveal to us the source of all such influence.

1. For one thing, whether due to temperament or to principle, he saw the dignity of service, and took delight in serving and helping others. Though it may have begun in his light-hearted and happy nature, it must have deepened into principle before it could have stood the severe tests to which it was put—as, for example, in prison, where he might easily have been soured by brooding over the injustice of his sentence and the hardness of his lot. But, in prison or out of it, he turned so easily to bearing others' burdens and putting his hand to others' work, that it is evident he was inspired by unselfish regard for those about him, whether his fellow-servants in Potiphar's house or his fellow-prisoners in the king's gaol. He had something of the self-devotion that comes from self-forgetfulness. He had had early dreams of his own pre-eminence, of the great position in the world he was to attain, in which his sheaf stood upright and the sheaves of his brethren did obeisance to his, and in which the sun and the moon and the stars bent before him; but now in his trial he did not wait for these dreams to come true before he would bestir himself. In his lot as a slave, and afterwards as a prisoner, he started right away making the most of the situation, throwing himself into his work, without thought that it was menial and beneath him. He was ready to serve anywhere, just because he took an unfeigned delight in serving. 'He found grace in his master's sight,

and he served him,' with pleasant eagerness. He brought sunshine into the dungeon, and made life easier for all by his friendly, unselfish conduct, so that it could be said of him that whatsoever the prisoners did he was the doer of it.

2. Again, the position Joseph took, both inside the prison and outside it, was the natural dominance due to character. A man who added to his lovable qualities such strength of will and such complete self-control was bound to take precedence. He had come through the fire untarnished, with only a keener glitter of steel and a finer edge. The peace of a good conscience kept him from being soured by the injustice of his sentence. His conscious probity freed him from all personal care, and made it possible for him to devote himself to the service of others. Such a character as the story depicts could not fail to command influence, a character so strong and so sweet, so controlled and yet so buoyant. The bright cheerfulness which was his great charm was one of the fruits of character. It was the result of that integrity of conscience for which he suffered and through which also he triumphed. It was no mere chance then, but was indeed the inevitable effect of his character, that Joseph laid hold of his kingdom of personal influence even within the narrow bounds of his prison, so that 'he found favour in the sight of the keeper of the prison,' as formerly 'he found grace in his keeper's sight,' as he served him.

3. The third and deepest reason which explains this influence was his faith. The inspiring source of his life and of his character was religion. Here we get down to the bedrock. It was Joseph's confidence in God which bred in him his strength of character, and which moved him to constant service. This is the foundation of all the rest. In his direst temptation he was upheld by a sense of rectitude and a sense of honour, so that he would have been ashamed to repay his master's kindness and trust by base ingratitude; but the chief secret of his strength was the thought of his relation to God, 'How can I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?' In addition to the motives which ought to weigh with any honourable man, there is the supreme motive of religion. The inner and impregnable line of his defence is his faith in God. His nobility of nature had its roots deep down in his spiritual life. The air of distinction and the easy gracefulness with which he won men's hearts were not mere surface qualities. A constant reference to a higher law and a higher will gave stamina to his character, and kept him from the pitfalls that menace the man who is merely good-natured and obliging.

The man who has no deeper motive than that of pleasing others, or even serving them, becomes pliable and cannot be depended on. All Joseph's amiability would not have stood the tests to which he was subjected, if there had not been behind them this root-virtue of strength; and even the strength would have broken under the weight, if it had not been inspired by the assurance of the presence of God. This meant the introduction of principle into his life. Trace back the qualities we have been considering to their fountain-head, and we see them springing from faith. His delight in serving and his self-devotion were not the result of a desire to be a favourite among his fellows. That motive will not carry one very far. Joseph was enabled to look not altogether on his own things but also on the things of others, because he at the same time looked on higher things. The real favour he found in the sight of men owed its origin to the favour of God.

So linked were these in the sweet and sunny early life of Joseph that we cannot but think of the boyhood of Jesus, as 'He increased in wisdom and stature, and in favour with God and man.' And when Joseph, too, like Jesus, had to choose between the favour of men and the favour of God, he chose the hard way, the way of the Cross, rather than give up his Heavenly Friend.[1]

Fourth Sunday in Lent.

Grace.

'The grace of God.'—1 Co 1[4].

Many of the distinctively Christian words used by our Lord and His Apostles were just old words which came into the New Testament from the Septuagint: a Greek translation of the Old Testament, made at Alexandria about 284 B.C. These were old classical Greek words—such as Love, Hope, Faith—into which our Lord in His wonderful way breathed new and beautiful meanings without changing or misusing them; as He always beautifies and turns to gold everything He touches.

In the Septuagint we find this word *charis* used for the most part in that old primary sense, beauty of form or manner, or sometimes of conduct or demeanour. It is not till we arrive at the Proverbs and the Prophets that there creeps into it the idea of favour on God's part to man. And in its last occurrence, in Zechariah, we find for the first

[1] H. Black, *According to my Gospel*, 173.

time the dawn of the Christian meaning: 'I will pour upon the house of David the spirit of grace, and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced.'

But in the New Testament we get the full brightness of the gospel meaning shining out of the word; and it takes its place at last as a jewel in the golden treasury of Christian language, which has ever since enriched the world. It is the gem shining in Mary's hair when she first appears before us, 'Ave Maria, Gratia plena.' It ushers in the Birth of God —'And we beheld his glory, full of grace and truth.'

Grace, on a Christian's lips, whether he know it or not, means this: 'beautiful gratuitous favour,' given to the world of men by God, through the only means by which He ever deals with the world, Jesus Christ—the Incarnate Word of the Father. It is called grace, because it is the full and final expression of all the infinite beauty of God's character, in that it bestows upon men the ineffable privilege of union with God. And it is 'gratuitous,' because it does this at the price of God's own life. For, to make it possible, He stepped down into our strait and misery, and identified Himself with our creature-nature, and underwent our due penalty that we might identify ourselves with His purity and so qualify for a share in His glory.

And so grace is no vague subjectivity. It is the most dynamic and beautiful thing that is to be had in this world. The most beautiful, because its sire is Love and its mother is Sacrifice. The most powerful, because it confers upon man the power and the right to share, yes, and even to deserve—which is more wonderful still—the glory of God.

Grace is the medicine of character, and the food of the soul. It is omnipotent, like its Giver. It can turn a churl into a gentleman, and a fool into a sage.

1. Now self-discipline, alone, cannot do this, but grace can, and does. For grace works, not negatively, but positively. It does not only aim at the excision of the bad thing, but puts in the good thing, which grows and grows until there is no room left for the bad thing. Salvation is not a negation. It is not merely being free from sin; it is being full of light. It is not like the call of the mother to the little girl in the street, 'Go and see what Tommy is doing, and tell him he mustn't.' Into the swept and garnished soul came seven other demons, worse than the first; for it was not furnished.

It is sin that is the negation of virtue; virtue is the positive thing. If we are proud, we do not want merely to get rid of our pride; we want to get humility. If we are unchaste, we do not want just to stop being so; we want to get purity; which is not the negation of the sexual passion, but the consecration and sublimation of it.

And grace puts in these things, because it puts in Jesus Christ; and the good thing gradually chokes the bad and crowds it out. And so, slowly, but surely, we come to look back with real distaste on the old ideals and standards of life and conduct, and when temptation comes, though our first thought may be, 'How pleasant it would be to yield!' our second is this: 'No—I don't really want it. It isn't good enough.' This plane of development, if we can rise into it, is salvation in process and in being.

Do not imagine for a moment that this work of grace upon the soul involves depletion of character, or loss of individuality. On the contrary, its sure end and aim is the development of personality in its true perfection. Only by its means can man, as a person, ever come to his true focus. A Christian's ideal self lies potentially reserved for him in the New Humanity, which is the Christ. 'We have a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.' 'We are being kept by the power of God through faith unto a salvation ready to be revealed.' We are 'growing up into him in all things, which is the head.'

2. And then, grace does another wonderful thing. Even suppose our own efforts could make us good, we would be unworthy and incapable of that union with God which is our destiny. Unqualified by any part or share in the God-Man who is the only Medium between flesh and Deity, the objective taint of fallen and unatoned humanity would still exclude us from all vital relation with the unapproachable purity of God. No degree of natural virtue can lift man into contact with the footpace of God's throne; much less into the heaven of His heart. But even this miracle is possible to grace. For it does not merely concede, or pronounce, man worthy of union with God. It makes him so. There is no putative compromise about it; it is qualification pure and simple. It does not merely impute to man, but actually imparts to him, the merit by which his pioneer has opened the way to God. So that, when man—the process of his redemption perfected—attains his eternal destiny, he enters on his rights. For He passes into Christ's kingdom as part of Christ. The deserts and merits of that body whose organic member he is have passed into him and become his own.

We are in the holy season of Lent. The name comes from an old Anglo-Saxon word, *lencten*,

which means 'spring'; probably because Lent is in the spring of the year. But there is a deeper fitness in the name, and a mystical. For Lent is, or should be, the time of the new life of the soul; the yearly spring in which she so renews her dispositions that the life of God creeps up with new vigour into her veins, and she puts forth fresh shoots of holiness. But this spiritual spring differs from the ordinary spring of Nature in that there is, or should be, a greater luxuriance every year of leaf and flower and fruit. Making full allowance for that backsliding which is inseparable from our earthly efforts towards God, the record of the Book of Life ought to find us nearer to God than we were a year ago. It is not that every Easter should acclaim some specific sin conquered, some particular grace acquired, though God grant it may be so, but that every Lent, year by year, ought to achieve something towards raising the whole tone and quality of the soul.

The chief cause that hinders this ideal is sloth; the subtlest and deadliest enemy of the Christian; the ugly, negative thing that scarcely seems a sin, whereas it comes to us with all the sins in the universe hidden in its knapsack. It is the last and most insidious of all the capital sins, because it deters and separates us from the only remedy for sin—the use of grace. It is commonly said that Satan tempts us to sin; but he has a labour-saving device more effective than a hundred sins; he tempts us to sloth. All the sins in the world cannot hurt or hinder us when once God's grace has cancelled them; the tactic of the enemy is therefore directed against grace.

Now there is only one effectual antidote of sloth; and that is love. No other power can touch or stir it. The laziest person in the world will rouse himself to action for the sake or favour of one he truly loves. Seeing, then, that the love of Christ is itself a grace, or gift given by Him; and that this love is the only force which can galvanize the self-loving sluggish soul into the active practice of 'the means of grace, and the hope of glory'; let us implore the Holy Spirit for the gift of love, that the animal inertia, which makes men and women careless of the call of the Physician, may be counteracted by the enchanting vision of His beauty.

Let us sustain our communions, our efforts at grace-given self-control, our church-going, our meditations, and our prayers. We will be ambitious that Holy Week and Easter shall not find us scrambling to 'make good' lost ground—for none but God can 'make good,' or make us good; but advanced a little closer to the Standard of Calvary, grown somewhat higher in the stature that is Jesus, a little nearer to His heart.[1]

FIFTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Backgrounds of Life.

'Abraham lifted up his eyes, and saw the place afar off.'—Gn 22^4.

'I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills, from whence cometh my help.'—Ps 121^1.

Let us think for a little about the mountain backgrounds of life. Our lives are like a great landscape: each life has its own foreground and background; the foreground full of detail, full of the movement of our daily work, looming much larger on our sight than the distance beyond it, pressing upon us calls of business that we cannot put off, keeping our thoughts immersed in the ceaseless hurry and hustle of our professional career, calling continually for our immediate attention to this or that thing that has to be done. Such is the foreground of life. And then behind all this multiplicity of detail and movement come the wider horizons, the larger aspirations, the deeper convictions, the eternal truths, the unchangeable principles to which we must continually lift up our eyes if our life is to have any general plan or purpose. These are the mountain backgrounds. Both foreground and background are equally indispensable. But there is this difference between them. Men, as a rule, are naturally inclined to pay far more attention to the foreground than to the background. There are, indeed, sluggish or visionary natures which are content to stand aside from the ordinary activities of life, but these are exceptional. Most men find their immediate daily duties so engrossing that they are apt to neglect the view beyond. The mountain distances become blurred or blotted out. That is a great loss—how great a loss our Lord teaches us Himself by His own example. We cannot suppose that He, in His busy daily life, ever really put God out of His thoughts; always He must have had with Him the sense of His Heavenly Father's presence. Yet none the less He felt the need of going up into a mountain apart to pray. How much greater is our need of lifting up our eyes to the mountains from whence cometh our help.

The idea that life is like a landscape is a mere metaphor, of course, but it may be helpful and suggestive. Let us look at some of the moral and spiritual backgrounds.

[1] T. H. Passmore, in *Lenten Sermons*, 116.

1. There is *the background of the inner personality*, for instance. Behind the foreground of conduct comes the background of character. The teaching of Jesus covers the whole range of this spiritual landscape. He says, 'Keep my commandments'—that is, the rule of conduct. But He also says (and we feel that it is a still deeper saying), 'Ye must be born again'—that is, the need of regeneration of character. These two sayings are closely connected. Conduct and character must be in harmony, or there can be no real sincerity of life. Many lives, we all know, never attain this sincerity. Sometimes a man's character is better than we should infer from his words and actions. He talks, it may be, flippantly; he does things that are inconsiderate and wrong-headed, but his heart is in the right place. Sometimes, on the other hand, the character is worse than the conduct. A man may be a hypocrite; his conformity to the moral law may be purely conventional. When these discrepancies exist, which of the two elements is the more important? Ought we to focus our attention more on the foreground or the background? There are hard-headed, practical people who have no eyes for anything but action. 'Do your duty,' they tell us, 'and do not worry about the condition of your soul.' But that seems a short-sighted view. What are all your external actions worth, apart from your inner personality—apart from the real you, the deep-down you, as some one calls it? Our conduct lies open to our inspection. We cannot help knowing about it, but how little we sometimes know about our inward self. Do we not all need to raise our eyes from the foreground of our daily words and actions to the background of our dimly discerned personality?

2. Then, again, there is *the background of prayer*. Every true prayer, it has been said, has its background and its foreground. The foreground of prayer is the intense immediate longing for some blessing which seems to be absolutely necessary for the soul to have; the background of prayer is the quiet, earnest desire that the Will of God, whatever it may be, should be done. Examine from this point of view our Lord's perfect prayer at Gethsemane. In front we see the intense longing that the cup of agony and death might pass away from Him; but behind there stands the strong, steadfast desire that the Will of God should be done. Take away either of these conditions and the prayer becomes less perfect.

3. Take, again, *the background of Divine truth*. What do we see as we look down on the foreground of our lives in these days of controversy? There lies before us a series of battle-scenes full of noise and confusion—the conflict of parties within the Church, the conflict of Church and Church, the conflict of Christian and non-Christian belief, the conflict of religion and agnosticism. Our brain seems to reel as we survey the combat and perhaps take part in it ourselves. How shall we keep our head amidst these fierce charges and war-cries? How shall we save ourselves from using our own creed as a shibboleth, or from beating our religious convictions into weapons of controversy? How, we ask? There is but one way. We must lift up our eyes to the still, solemn mountain background which rises far away beyond the scene of conflict. There, on the distant horizon of our lives, we shall find, if we have but faith to see, that eternal truth which is one aspect of the nature of God, that truth which tests and explains and reconciles our partial and conflicting beliefs.

4. One other spiritual background let us mention—it is *the background of the Christian ideal*. Behind the foreground of the actual daily lives lived by Christian men and women comes the distant ideal—and do we not constantly feel that it is unattainably distant?—which the Master has set before His Church. The teaching which presents that ideal is no mere dead record of a life that has passed away: it is a perennial reservoir of suggestiveness. Age after age has witnessed the reincarnation of the Christian ideal. It has been assailed in these days, as it has often been assailed in times past. But the movement of modern thought has not been without its compensating advantages to Christianity, and I think we may claim that, in some respects, we are in closer touch than men used to be with the mind and the heart of Jesus Christ. We have been able to give new meanings to some of the familiar sayings, and we may be quite sure that we have not yet exhausted all that Christ has to teach us. Across the temptations and struggles, the difficulties and perplexities, with which the foreground of life is strewed, the Christian can still look up with confidence to the ideal which Christ sets before him, and feel the value of its example and guidance.[1]

SIXTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

Failure.

'What, could ye not watch with me one hour?'—Mt 26^{40}.

Carved upon a memorial stone to a Confederate

[1] H. G. Woods, *At the Temple Church*, 232.

leader in Charleston, South Carolina, are these words:

The Hour of Conflict,
The Day of Defeat,
The Years of Oppression
Brought to his Courage
No slackness;
And to his Loyal Service
No Abatement.

No such words could have been written of the steadfastness of Jesus' friends at Gethsemane, for the day of defeat found them sleeping, the year of oppression brought slackness, and crises caused their erstwhile loyal service to be abated. Jesus found Himself in solitude, with no human hand or voice to assist Him in the supreme moment of human history.[1]

'What, could ye not watch with me one hour?' What is the meaning of these words? The disciples by the light of the moon pass into the wood, staying near the main road; Peter, James and John going farther within. Why should they watch and pray? Is it that in these last hours Jesus is eager to be given some time to fight His battle in communion with His Father in heaven, to receive from God insight into the full meaning of what is to befall Him and strength to bear it? His was a conflict in which no stranger dared intrude, and so He withdrew Himself even from the chosen three. It was desirable that the spying emissaries of the priests should not come upon Him without warning. This probably explains in part the words of Jesus. His enemies were approaching and He desired time for undisturbed fellowship with God, and when the soldiers came He was to be given warning of their approach. There were other reasons. In the agonizing strife He longed for the company of those men who, in spite of their frailties, were His dearest and best friends. The animal receives a mortal wound and steals to its lonely lair to die alone, but man, in his last hour, is comforted by the presence of faithful ones who, by their prayers and companionship, support the soul ere it takes flight. Could ye not watch with Me one hour? Could ye not in prayer support Me, in love surround Me?

While these reasons may not have been absent from His mind, the chief reason was for their own sakes. Trials greater than they could envisage were to befall them; the Bridegroom was to be removed; their Leader was to fall into the hands of evil men, and then, bereft of His counsel, they would be tested as never before, and in order that they might pass through their fiery furnace unscathed they must remain on the alert. We know how sadly they failed. They did not realize how momentous the hour was; they had never before found their Master overcome by His enemies. When the people desired to throw Him from the pinnacle of the temple He passed through their midst unnoticed. A few months before, soldiers had come to arrest Him but found themselves helpless in the presence of His Divine dignity, and the disciples must have felt that in some strange way the Master would again evade anything to His hurt. They had not learned that, for a purpose they could not understand, the hour had come when Jesus would use none of His Divine powers, the Hour of the Prince of Darkness, and so they fell asleep, and the slumber of these early morning hours explains the cowardly escape, the rash action of a man only half-awake who smote off a soldier's ear, and the persistent denial of the disciple who was so certain that he would never fail His Lord.[2]

Why did not His friends stay by Him in the supreme moment?

First, because the will-power of His friends gave way in the crisis. They had not counted on so long or so hard a road. There were reproach and hazards of which they had never dreamed in those evenings by the Sea of Galilee, when the sun was all a glory of red and yellow over the Judean hills. Although will-power is not as strong as subtle, instinctive forces within us, nevertheless there are times when only iron restraint can save us. General Gordon, who met his death in the Soudan beneath the spears of the Mahdi, was once led to a room full of treasure and told by high Chinese officials that this treasure would be his if he would countenance certain dishonourable practices. Iron will developed in desert marches, in fighting disease, and in upholding the Empire's honour in three continents, came forward to save him and gave him power to refuse. There are unexpected tests, crises for which no one is prepared, temptations for which no one has developed a specific defence; and, when the rush of circumstances is upon one, all one can do is to fall back in determination upon a former dedication and pray for strength to hold fast.

Again, Jesus was lonely because even His closest friends were unable to share His dreams. Although Cecil Rhodes may be blamed for a crass and material imperialism, his steadfastness in holding to a dream

[1] G. Stewart, *The Crucifixion in our Street*, 156.

[2] A. Chisholm, *High Roads and Cross Roads*, 67.

of a united South Africa under the British flag is one of the outstanding dreams of Empire of the last century. Down at the Kimberley Club, as his intimates grouped about him at night, he was wont to take down a great map of Africa, and, placing his hands on the territory beyond Cape Colony up to the central lakes, he would exclaim: 'All that shall be red; that is my dream.' And through long years of fragile health and immense difficulty he held to this dream, which was finally realized.

Jesus' friends had failed to appropriate for themselves His vision; there was no set to their minds to carry them onward in the midst of the gathering storm, and they slumbered and slept, insensitive to the immense significance of that night in the life of Jesus. They did not realize that for the sake of His dream of a new era in human existence Jesus committed His all, and God's all, to a farcical trial and a savage crucifixion as the utmost which love could do in redeeming men. The sheer unthinking dullness and the inability of His friends to use their imagination hurt Jesus more than all else. It was a time for great faith and great friendship, and Jesus received vacillating indifference.

But His disciples did not lose the battle that night; they had lost it long before. Their action on the fatal evening had been prepared for in the previous weeks. What we think to-day we shall do to-morrow; what we are at twenty we are apt to be at forty, only more so. Weeks of spiritual slackness, even if in the presence of Christ, had made easy their action on Jesus' night of agony.

It is difficult to keep a dream undimmed when trouble comes:

> To hope till hope creates from its own wreck
> The thing it contemplates.

To believe in a cause when it is under foot and trampled upon, to cherish an ideal of a world state when it is defeated by the largest majority against any issue in the history of mankind, to follow Christ closely when He is alone in the Garden, sweating great drops of blood and grappling with the issues of life and death. Little did this sleepy group know that later generations would frame the prayer:

> By thine agony and bloody sweat,
> Good Lord, deliver us.

The supreme crisis in human history was approaching; the greatest single manifestation of God's outreaching love was about to be set forth, but this insensitive group was unable to keep vividly before them the dream of the Kingdom which Christ had come to establish.

Not only did their wills and their dreams give out, but also their belief. They had lost faith in themselves and left Jesus alone without their presence. Many of us develop a sense of inadequacy, and feel that we are useless to the world and to God. Jesus offers the world a conception of human personality which says to each, 'You are precious, you are valuable, you are loved.' But on this ghastly night these men, who could have meant so much by their mere companionship, had no confidence in themselves. They had lost sight of what they had to offer of friendship in His hour of tribulation.

We must believe in ourselves in order to help God. The Son of God is lonely now as He was in Gethsemane for responsive human hearts. And we must believe in Jesus. He asks men to give their wills, their dreams, their faith, to Him. He promises, in return, not ease or comfort, but, perchance, the promise to Garibaldi's Red Shirts, 'forced marches, battles, and death,' but in the end that spiritual victory which shall overcome the crassness and brutality of the world.[1]

[1] G. Stewart, *The Crucifixion in our Street*, 158.

Christ's Answer to the Question about Divorce.

By Professor D. S. Margoliouth, D.Litt., Oxford.

According to the Lewisian Syriac of Mt 19[3] in answer to the question '*Is it permitted to a man to dismiss his wife on any pretext?*' Jesus replied:

לא קריתון דמן דעבד לדברא אף לנקבתא הזו עבד

'*Have ye not read the* ruling *of Him who made the male, who also made the female?* (Gn 2[24])—"*For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother, and cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh.*" *Hence they are not two, but one flesh. That which God hath coupled let not man sunder.*' The use of a simple ד ('of') for 'the

ruling of ' or ' the opinion of ' pervades the Aramaic of the Talmud, and examples can be found whenever we open it. Three examples cited from as many lines will illustrate not only this idiom, but the stenographic style in which these discussions were conducted. The words which the hearer has to supply are printed in Roman type.[1]

' *Now, too, that* the opinion *of R. Chiya has not* authority, *we must compel him* to swear *from* the ruling *of R. Nachman ; for there is a Mishnah :* If A says to B *thou hast a mina of mine* and B replies *I have nothing of thine, he is not compelled* to swear. *But R. Nachman said, Still we make him take an oath of encouragement.* The opinion *of R. Nachman is a correction.*'

So construed, the question in the Gospel receives an appropriate reply. Jesus cites the ruling not of Hillel or Shammai, but of ' Him who made both male and female.' By mistaking this *of* for *that* the Greek translator became involved in a series of interpolations, which in the main have been well enucleated by Merx. The text seemed to mean, *Have ye not read that He who made the male, made also the female.* Reference to the LXX furnished the text Gn 1^{27}, *male and female made He them,* which is introduced, though it has no bearing on the question. After the first *made* of the Syriac, *originally* was introduced to avoid tautology ; and the words *and said* were inserted before the quotation of Gn 2^{24}, because this text does not follow 1^{27} in the original. *For this cause* in 2^{24}, the only text really cited, does not of course refer to what is said in 1^{27}, but to the narrative of Gn 2, where Eve is shown to have been originally part of Adam.

The Pharisees asked this question *tempting Him,* or rather *trying Him,* probing His Rabbinical lore and legal acumen. The question was well suited for that purpose, and the discussion in the last pages of B. *Gittin* indicates the mode wherein a Rabbi might be expected to deal with it. It is there shown that the verse Dt 24^{1} is ambiguous both in syntax and expression. The phrase *because* (or *if*) *he has found in her impropriety of a sort* may be interpreted in several ways. It might mean that *any* pretext would justify a bill of divorce ; it might mean that some serious reason would be required. It is incredible that any school supposed there could be a reference to actual misconduct either pre-marital or post-marital : the Law punished these offences with death (Dt 22, etc.), and the Gospels imply that this Law was by no means a dead letter.

The order of the dialogue in Matthew is natural. The Pharisees ask a question which they expect will be answered, if at all, by a reference to Dt 24^{1} ; Christ surprises them by citing Gn 2^{24} as settling the matter. What then, they ask, does He make of Dt 24^{1} ? He replies that it was a concession to ' hard-heartedness.' His own ruling (speaking like one with authority and not as the Scribes) is that dismissal of a wife followed by remarriage (except in the case of the wife's misconduct) involved the perpetrator in the sin of adultery.

The Pharisees say no more, but the disciples make an objection. In the Greek this reads : *εἰ οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ ἀνθρώπου μετὰ τῆς γυναικός, it is not expedient to marry.* The R.V. renders the Greek words : *If the case of the man is so with his wife.* Schleusner and Grimm confess that they can produce no case of *αἰτία* used in this sense ; Moulton and Milligan quote a papyrus, where, however, the word has its ordinary sense of *cause, reason for conduct.* The Syriac is also difficult : אן הכנא איתּ עדליא בית נברא לאנתתא, which Merx renders : *Wenn so das Rechtsverhältniss zwischen dem Manne und dem Weibe ist,* which is doubly incorrect ; the word rendered *Rechtsverhältniss* means ' blame,' ' reproach,' or the like, and the syntax violates the rule given by Nöldeke, *Syr. Gramm.* § 303. The rendering offered by the Armenian Version seems the only possible one : *If thus there is guilt with the man and with the woman,* i.e. if divorce involves the parties in guilt, which in the Syriac is meant by *If thus there is blame between the man and the woman.* The Greek translator wrongly inserted a definite article.

If we turn to the account in the Second Gospel ($10^{2ff.}$), we find the errors due to mistranslation of Matthew's Syriac reproduced, with various alterations. The question asked by the Pharisees is not that whereon Rabbinical subtlety had been expended, viz. the limitations of the licence granted in Dt 24^{1}, but simply whether divorce was permissible. Instead of replying, Christ asks them what the Law of Moses on this subject was. They cite the substance of Dt 24^{1}. Christ declares that this was a concession to ' hard-heartedness,' but *from the beginning of creation He made them male and female ; for this cause shall a man leave his father, etc. What then God hath coupled let not man sunder.*

As has been seen, *for this cause* in the text quoted refers to something so different that it is customary now to regard the two texts as belonging to inconsistent accounts belonging to different authors and ages. The charge of seriously misquoting Scripture, which the translator of Matthew avoided by inserting the words *and said* after he had erroneously introduced Gn 1^{27}, has now materialized ; the quota-

[1] *Baba Metsia, 5a,* near the end.

tion of Gn 1^{27}, which is merely off the point in Matthew, in Mark's account involves the Speaker in error. Some other difficulties are introduced. Possibly the stenographic style might excuse the introduction of *He made them* without any word having preceded to which the implied pronoun can refer; in the Greek of Matthew it is preceded by *He who made originally*. In Matthew, *let no man sunder* is appropriate *before* the mention of Moses; in Mark, where Moses is the person who sunders, *man* or *a man* is surprising, since the great Lawgiver was no ordinary man.

In Mark, the Pharisees get no further reply. The disciples 'when they are back in the house,' and so free from the presence of the Pharisees, do not bring the objection recorded by Matthew, but repeat the Pharisees' question. The reply is: *Whosoever dismisses his wife and marries another woman committeth adultery against her, and if she herself shall put away her husband and marry another man, she committeth adultery.* The exception admitted in Matthew's account is omitted; on the other hand, a clause is introduced which takes us out of the region of Jewish law to that of Roman. By the latter the wife could initiate proceedings for divorce [1]; by the former she could not. Josephus, a good authority on such a matter, as he himself divorced a wife, is emphatic on this point: Salome sent her husband 'a bill of divorce, not according to the Jewish laws; for among us a man may do this, but a woman, even if separated, may not marry of her own right without permission of her former husband.' [2] The author of this addition was then more familiar with Roman law than with Jewish.

In 1 Co 7^{10} St. Paul ascribes this precept to 'the Lord,' whereas the following are, he confesses, his own. Perhaps this is the source of the addition.

The omission of the exception (the case of the wife's misconduct) may be connected with the *Lex Julia de Adulteriis*, which enforced separation in such cases; at some time before Christianity became the religion of the Empire the death penalty was introduced in lieu of banishment, which appears to have been the punishment of the *Lex Julia*. Since the ordinary law dealt with this particular case, it could be omitted.

[1] Walter, *Geschichte des Römischen Rechts*, § 522.
[2] *Antiquities*, xv. vii. § 10.

Implications of the Fatherhood of God.

By the Reverend John Douglas, M.A., Edinburgh.

I. For the Individual Christian.

The call of God to men is expressed by many of His servants in these days in terms of problems to be faced and solved, of a challenge to be taken up, of service to be rendered. It would sometimes seem as if the Kingdom of God in the earth were set forth as the proper object of the soul's faith and devotion, and the Christian life seems to be conceived largely as a kind of 'doing one's bit' in the Divine war that is 'on' in the world. Jesus is the great and splendid Captain in the fight, and our generation is summoned to battle by the call, 'The royal banners forward go': 'who follows in His train?'

That a vexatious individualism in the type of Christian salvation preached and held as normally satisfactory for generations, produced or provoked this reaction of emphasis is no doubt the case. 'What must I do to be saved?' found a well-worn answer which drove men in upon their own souls and there propounded for them their whole life-time's problem, so that they rarely got outside that. Something like this, at any rate, is freely said. Incidentally, it is a bold assertion in the face of a great century of missionary expansion such as the nineteenth was, not to speak of the many kinds of reforming and philanthropic activity which sprang out of its warm evangelicalism. It was surely a wise voice which reminded a great modern audience that there was perhaps something more to be desired in a faith which achieves than in a 'faith that inquires.' This was said in suggesting a comparison between the Victorian period —to name the spectral name — and our own; and if we work back from great things done, and greatly done, to the things which brought them forth, may we not find factors which are being neglected or set aside but which we need to magnify to-day? Some years ago a speaker to theological students said: 'There are three great factors in life, God and the world and the individual'—the

order of the words is perhaps worth noting—'and it is a dwarfed life that sees only itself and God.' This, of course, is true, but there needs to be said, also, that dwarfed is the life that sees only the world and God. It is apt in the end to see more of the world than of God. I believe that this does need to be said, since an over-emphasis of a very dangerous kind upon the Kingdom of God has been thrown into the scales, and now requires to be balanced by a proper re-emphasizing of individualism in these relationships of the soul.

The teaching of Jesus on the Fatherhood of God has something more radical and primary as a corollary than the brotherhood of man. The first concern of the Heavenly Father is with His children, and children are not looked upon or dealt with collectively but one by one. And I urge that our first concern in preaching and religious teaching, in uttering the call of God as His servants to men, is with individual relationships of the children towards their Father. Of course, this, immediately it is said, will command universal assent, nevertheless it tends to be obscured, and the very term of Jesus, the Kingdom of God—though not the full and true meaning of the term—has been made an instrument in obscuring it.

After all, the essential challenge—if the word must be persisted with—which being taken up brings in the Kingdom of God is not to banners and battles, marches and campaigns; it is to a personal attitude and relationship towards God, to know Him and trust Him as our Father. The right attitude may, indeed, be reached in the ranks of service, but it may not, and the inner compulsion to it may never arise there. For it is not difficult to be absorbed in the interest and glamour of the battle, and to have one's spirit of partisanship aroused by the conflict, so that one does not find the true motive for it, nor see the true end. And this is what actually does happen in many instances. They lack the deepest inspiration who have not arrived at the right relationship with God as He presents Himself to us and claims us as His children, that we may know Him in direct fellowship, and trust Him, and be gladly led by Him and inspired to all our thought and action. Is it irrelevant to recall here that Jesus declared the childlike spirit essential to citizenship in the Kingdom? I think not. Men may be able to see a rich and lofty way of fulfilling themselves in devotion to human service, holding that to be the true service of God, which in part it is; but there may be a subtle self-centredness here, nevertheless. And if, which seems a nobler way, they are so surrendered to some form of the service of humanity that they are careless of their own souls, magnificently self-forgetful, yet they are the poorer for that, and their contribution to the welfare of their fellows is more barren, is less tender and moving, than it might have been. Either way, men suffer from the loss always involved in self-sufficiency, not the less that they are not thinking of self—and are, perhaps, very conscious that they are self-forgetting! 'Our sufficiency is of God,' and we need Him in all the breadth and length and height and depth of His gifts and His self-giving, if we are to render in service the best that we can give and be. Our first necessity, both for ourselves and for our duty to others, is to know our need of God and to claim for ourselves all that God can do for us.

If God is our Father in the sense, and with the meaning of His Fatherhood, revealed in Jesus, we are to claim God, then, each of us, to the uttermost; just as men and women claimed Jesus in the days of His flesh. They did, all sorts and conditions of them, in all sorts of circumstances, and they may well be judged to have come often enough with pure self-regard in coming. They snatched at and claimed Jesus because they had some need or some cry of the soul to which they were sure He would respond. Now it was Jairus summoning Jesus with imperative fear to hurry Him to the rescue of his daughter; now it was a leper intruding his pitiful loathesomeness across the path of Jesus; again it was a group of men interrupting Him as He taught in a house, bringing Him their helpless friend; and again it was a blindly enthusiastic crowd of folk, hardly knowing what they wanted, forgetting time and distance and convenience, breaking in upon His solitude and leisure. In all such cases, and they must have been countless, Jesus laid Himself open with all His resources to the inroads of men's needs. Wherever He came those came to Him who, for one reason or another, cried out for strength or peace, satisfaction or comfort, or enlightenment, and He was accessible to them all. To the very end He was open ear and open heart to every voice and every claim of need; as the fellow-sufferer at Calvary suddenly realized, calling from his foundered ship of life, 'Lord, remember me'; and Jesus, in swift response, promised him safe passage to the haven of his desire, the kingdom better than his dreams.

That is Jesus' revelation of the Father—infinite Divine resources open to the cry and claim of men and women. This is what all men have in God—

inexhaustible springs of love, holiness, and power made available to every man; 'the unsearchable riches of his grace,' as Paul says, the heritage of every soul. It is of quite special importance, in view of the present-day tendency to socialize God, if one may so put it, to keep very outstanding and clear this sense of individual relationship. R. L. Stevenson wrote more than forty years ago to a friend whose vision, as Stevenson believed, had become distorted and lost perspective through sinking the spiritual interest of the individual in a kind of mass of material well-being: 'The house is, indeed, a great thing, and should be rearranged on sanitary principles; but my heart and all my interest are with the dweller, that ancient of days and day-old infant man.' It is a salutary reminder that the basis of all human relationships and arrangements and reconstructions is the individual soul, and that the end is its enrichment and ennobling. If so, and it is so, we must hold on to the individual's interest in and claim upon God, or, rather, first of all, God's self-committal to him and God's first claim upon him. There is no Kingdom of God, no 'heaven on earth,' without that.

It is on this thought of God that Christian Prayer, about which there is so much perplexity, is based. Prayer is the foundation of all fellowship that is to be rooted and grounded in God, and what fellowship can be deep and permanent which is not? Certainly, Jesus, who knew more about prayer than any other of the children of men, linked it with His own revelation of the Father and with the reality of God in His own consciousness. 'What man is there of you, whom, if his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? . . . If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him?' How queer and cruel it would be, Jesus thought with a kind of whimsical humour, to see a father answering his children's cry with so impossible a perversity. The passage is taken straight from the home at Nazareth, or from any home where the children run in hungry from school or play asking for a 'piece,' to use the familiar Scots expression. It is on these—may one say homely?—terms that Prayer is worth while. Prayer is the human child's recognition of the Father and his intercourse with Him; with One who, like the best kind of father, however infinitely beyond the best, is not only in authority as the head of the house, not only has power as the bread-giver, but is a genuine comrade of his bairns and their best friend. He remains associated in their minds all their days with their work and their play, their little jokes and their problems, the correcting of their faults, the comforting of their desolating sorrows, which he knew so small all the while, and with the gifts that brought their keenest remembered joys.

Along the line of such a conception of God we are to think our thoughts and to adjust our practice of Prayer. Thus we rise to freedom in prayer, claiming our own freedom, and acknowledging that God is free to do and to undo, to give and to withhold, according to His love and holiness and wisdom, and that He is not limited (except by these) in what He may do or give. Why, for example, should God be confined to gifts which are called 'spiritual,' for where, after all, are the boundary lines to be drawn between the spiritual and the material, and who is to mark them, that we should say to God, 'Thus far and no farther'? Did Jesus, in speaking of 'good things' which our Father has to give us, draw such lines of demarcation? No, to Him we may say anything, and may ask of Him freely and familiarly anything.

Again, this must satisfy our questions, which are often our remonstrances, as to 'answers to prayer.' We cannot expect to get merely what we ask for, or precisely always what we ask. This, indeed, would be imposing drastic limits upon the giving of God, and often enough it would be asking a gift with a poison and a sting in it. Besides, we must try to realize that we are being answered many a time before we are aware of it, if ever, indeed, we become aware; and gifts better than we have asked for, truer to God's love, are offered to us, and we decline them, or, rather, we do not see them. For through lack of sustained contact and communion with God we render ourselves incapable of seeing. 'A farmer,' so the tale runs, 'whose aim was not very true, was known to remark that some crows didn't know when they *were* shot.' This is not, I hope, too trivial to suggest the fact that we are oftentimes blind to God's response to His children's wants and appeals. His answers find us, and we do not know. He is far greater, both in what we recognize as great things, and in the 'little things that suit little minds,' both in Himself, and for us, than we imagine.

We must acknowledge, therefore, that we can only discover how and in what our prayers are being answered, by the constant communion which lets us more and more deeply into the secrets of God's ways; just as only so can we in human friendship come to understand the tricks and traits of the heart and mind of a friend. 'He will never

do this,' or, 'He will certainly do that,' the outsider may say, but we know better, knowing him. It may have taken a long while to arrive at that intuitive understanding, and the way may have lain through perplexities and painful misunderstandings, but it is clear now, and we can tread it with confidence. 'How much more,' as Jesus would say, is it so with the Best Friend who is our Father which is in heaven. We must be at pains to understand Him, waiting upon Him, as the Bible says, till we can say unclouded by a doubt, 'All our Father does is well.' This may cost us some Gethsemane of our own, but is there any consummation of prayer, any answer to prayer, that is finally greater than this? Surely, to be strong and free in the assurance of such a faith is to be the best that we can be for God and for man.

II. For Christian Behaviour.

The Fatherhood of God means that God, with all that 'God' means, has committed Himself to the love and care of every individual soul and life, which first of all involves that we are called and invited to claim Him to the uttermost for ourselves, as men and women did claim Jesus in the days of His flesh.

But the implications of this Fatherhood are wider far than those of individual interest and application. Christian attitude and behaviour have constant reference, as we realize more than ever to-day, to our neighbourhood and to the world of our fellow-men. It was with this specifically in mind that Jesus bade men become like God: 'be ye perfect even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.' This appeal to us to be like God is to be interpreted in terms of His Fatherhood and not otherwise, not, for instance, according to abstract nouns such as Holiness, or even Love. Father and Family are the ideas which will inspire and guide and regulate a true Christian conduct and practice of life. If we ask ourselves, How shall we organize our thought, control our impulses and feelings, order our conduct and business, and direct all our ways? we must answer, if our answer is to be Christian, By a right attitude and relationship towards God as our Heavenly Father, and towards our fellows as being, with us, of the one family of God. We shall then plan our lives from centre to circumference in such a way as to do our part in restoring and preserving the harmony of this family, and in promoting its welfare as God gives us to see wherein its welfare lies.

The Sermon on the Mount is a series of examples of the application of this spirit and principle in certain cases arising in the immediate environment—partly political, partly social, partly religious—of Jesus; and that environment must be kept in mind in the interpretation of it. The whole of the New Testament comes into line with the Sermon on the Mount whenever the writers are touching upon the behaviour of Christians in the family or in the church-group or in the world 'without.' The Epistle of St. James occurs to the mind at once in this connexion; and a notable illustration is found in the fourteenth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. For some men, the Apostle says, some practices are plainly legitimate if you confine their effects solely to the individual concerned; but you cannot do it. The world is not so built that you can, and society is not possible on such terms. No, you have to take into account 'the brother' even if in your strength you look upon him in pity—but you must beware of looking down upon him in contempt—as 'weak.' 'If thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably. Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died. . . . It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, nor anything whereby thy brother stumbleth, or is offended, or is made weak.' 'Happy is he,' says the Apostle, 'who does not bring himself under condemnation through indulgence in things which to him are privately legitimate.' The principle is plain enough, even if at times a precise application of it may seem to be in doubt. Only a veritable saturation of our souls by the Spirit of Jesus, ruling every thought and action of ours in regard to our fellow men and women, will safeguard us in the fogs of doubt: a standard to judge ourselves by, a test to apply strictly and constantly in our contacts with them.

It is sometimes said that in such matters as a moderate use of 'strong drink,' a man must be left to consult, and to decide according to the dictates of his own conscience; and that, of course, is true. But he and we must here know what is meant by conscience. Questions arise, and must be pressed, such as these. Is it a conscience educated by the principles of Jesus, in full accord with the conceptions of the Father and the Family which are to rule all conduct? Is it a conscience looking in the spirit of the Father on the weak brother so that one's action may tell upon him for good? Is it a conscience consulting itself and finding the voice of God within, and making decision in tune with His will and not with one's own individual inclination? Otherwise it will be a conscience for

which no Christian man can have much respect, nor can he—nor should he—pay honour to its verdict. Conscience needs to be educated, as was said on an historic occasion by a commoner to a queen, and the guiding lines for the education of it are to be found in Jesus' conceptions of Father and Family.

Again, to take a crucial case in Christian behaviour, Jesus in His teaching on Forgiveness relates to this the connexion between the Divine forgiveness and our willingness to forgive those who have wronged us. Clearly a man's unchristian reluctance to forgive like God renders impossible the harmony of His family which God has purposed :

> It is the little rift within the lute
> That by and by will make the music mute,
> And ever widening slowly silence all.

Thus the unforgiving soul is out of tune with the Father and His will, maintaining a discord which shuts out God's voice, and thus, opposing his grudging heart to God's wide ministry of reconciliation, he is not in a condition to receive the reconciling Spirit. The home which the Father is seeking to build and make is in every such case so far disquieted within itself, and rendered wretched, as an earthly home is, by the cloud of resentment and sullenness which hangs over it. How can one so out of sympathy with God and contributing to the persistence of the evil temper receive His forgiveness ? For, till the angry tides have subsided, the gifts of God cannot be borne into his soul. God will not forgive that unforgiving one, said Jesus, and we realize that He will not because He cannot. The unchristian temper and spirit must go before God can enter in to work His work of grace and peace. In some of our mining areas you will see houses with great cracks in their walls or off the straight, and propped up from collapsing by external beams to bind or support them, the results of great unfilled spaces in the sunless depths below, over whose vacancy the land has subsided. Every unlovingness in human thought and practice is something like that ; every lack of the spirit of God's Fatherhood in life, whether in the private circle, or on the wider scale, has ugly results which men are disturbed and endangered by, and which God hates.

'About the year 412 A.D.'—Mr. Glover tells the story—'a new governor came from Constantinople to Tripoli, and began to misuse the people he had to govern. Synesius, the most charming figure of the century, . . . and now bishop of the place, all against his own inclination and sense of fitness, wrote boldly to the governor, and told him he was using men as if they were cheap ; but "precious among creatures is man, precious, in that for him Christ was crucified." ' That was all in the temper which the Heavenly Father seeks for the making of His family of mankind, and it will serve to introduce another point of vital importance in considering Christian behaviour from this point of view. It is this, that fellowship with God and participation in His Kingdom depend on the family ideal and family spirit becoming an active force in all our relationships with the world.

Jesus 'pictures a God involved in all the tragedy of all the world.' As it has been memorably put (by Mr. W. R. Maltby): 'Suppose that by His angel God said to us : "See ! Here are two worlds. Choose which you will enter. If you enter the one, you shall neither be helped nor hurt by any one's deeds or misdeeds, save your own. You shall carry your own burden, but no other, and have your own joy, but no other ; and nothing that men call 'undeserved' shall ever come to you. But if you enter this other, you come into a family that is in trouble, and you must share the family trouble, and your joy must be the family joy. You shall reap in joy and sorrow where others have sown. You are promised no immunity from the consequences of other people's sins, neglects, and ignorances, nor they from yours. Only this you may have : that God also has chosen to be of this family and He is always to be found there." If we can imagine such an option being offered to us, can we doubt what our choice would be ?' Here is the true motive of social and missionary service. That service, in every phase of it, is ideally nothing less than the practice of 'the limitless brotherhood of Jesus,' which reveals the limitless Fatherhood of God—a family affair in which every member of the family has an interest and a part. The whole of a Christian's life, and the whole of the Church's life, is the Divine ministry of reconciliation. The business of brotherhood, as a distinguished missionary to Moslems (Canon Gairdner) once put it, must not be delegated to a few, while the rest say, 'Here you ! Go and do the brotherhood—we will pay you for it.' This is the mission of all Christians ; how little realized by whole masses within the Church, we know to our shame and confusion of face.

In the early verses of the fifteenth chapter of St. Luke Jesus protests the compulsion which is on the good shepherd to find even the one lost sheep, notwithstanding the security of all the others, divinely discontented while it is lost and while

the flock is yet incomplete. 'God's sheep are men,' an Old Testament prophet reminds us, as if to hold us close to realities. 'God's sheep are men,' and a new element enters into the picture of the parable. That is to say, the flock left safe in the fold are not passive, with nothing to do but browse and rest and wait till the shepherd comes back; nay, they are people with the shepherd's call for company and companionship and co-operation in their ears as he goes out on his quest. But what if you are out of sympathy and indifferent towards the shepherd in this age-long venture of 'the mountains cold and bare'? What if a Church is laggard and close-fisted about the shepherd's anxiety about the lost and wandering one? Is this not automatically a self-expulsion from fellowship with him? And if we turn our backs upon the ministries which reflect his mind towards men, in whatever direction these ministries turn—and they radiate in countless directions—are we not turning our backs on the 'author and perfecter' of all such ministries?

Surely the Christian fellowship only holds together by 'holding communion with the Heavenly Father along the line of everything that interests Him—a large programme.' He calls us to face the wilderness with Him in the Quest, to join Him—as it needs must be sometimes—on the 'via dolorosa,' and can we doubt that a genuine Christian fellowship involves this, nothing less? For my part, I cannot pretend to excuse the presence within the Church of the calm critic of missionary endeavour, a creature to be wondered at, to be sorrowed over, one of the most unchristian things in the world claiming the great name of Christian! How should he know what the name means, who has never felt in any wise the breadth of the pressure of God's burden of the world, nor walked with Christ on the road of His far adventures among the souls of men?

It is, perhaps, not so much to be wondered at that many within the membership of the Church should demand the avoidance of politics by the Church. The dangers of this contact are obvious by this time. But does this demand also mean that political service has nothing to do with righteousness, the righteousness that 'exalteth a nation,' or with mercy, which God desires rather than sacrifice, or with world-brotherhood and world-peace, which are the Kingdom of God in some of its essential aspects? No, whether we like it or no, let us be assured that Christ walks the roads of the political world also, seeking for men and the spirit which will make this earth-home of ours a fit dwelling for the family of our Father, wherein peace and holiness may dwell undisturbed and unashamed. The way is long, and rough with knotty problems, but towards the prizes of this high calling Christ calls men and women more surely to-day than ever.

The ministry of reconciliation has a place in it for every one who claims the Christian name, and for every company of Christians. When Jesus dispelled Simon Peter's fears, and lifted the penitent disciple to his feet, in the incident recorded in the fifth chapter of St. Luke, He associated a career of service with the implied assurance of forgiveness. 'I will make you a fisher of men,' said Jesus. We have to give this a wide application—wide as forgiveness itself—not confining it within an apostolic group, whether ancient or modern. The wider our interpretation is the nearer it will come to the spirit and meaning of Jesus. The ministry of reconciliation, which has for its end the completion of God's family to His glory, has a place in it for every man and his gifts. This is an ideal test which may be applied to guide us in our outlook upon politics, to revert to that point, and to control the Church's activity in this region. Nothing may be done, no word spoken, no line taken, but such as are clearly in harmony with the Divine family ideal. I believe that this will at least imply the minimum of compulsion and the maximum of educative work and of moral influence, the creation of a right atmosphere and of a Christian public conscience, rather than propaganda for definite measures. In the progress and increase of the family spirit, in the success of the ministry of reconciliation, many wrongs and injustices, many misunderstandings and twisted relationships, many roots of bitterness and strife will find it impossible to live. The time will be hastened, however far off it may be, of a world wherein unrighteousness cannot dwell, by every triumph of the family spirit. It all comes back to this, that mankind, that the whole world-order, as well as, in the narrower sphere of things, the neighbour and the fellow-worker, can be seen and dealt with rightly only in the light of the Heavenly Father's will for the human family.

Every Christian man is, in view of this, commissioned with a gift and a task of his own, and ought to be a 'fisher of men.' The gift is not necessarily, of course, a gift of tongues, nor the task in any sense official. For, after all, the richest and most powerful gift is that of the spirit in a man that works as the Spirit of God; and the high common task is to carry into every relation-

ship the touch of the Good Shepherd's quest, His quest of a completed flock, 'that there may be one flock, one shepherd.' When all is said, all doors are open to this ministry, for wherever His disciples go Jesus goes with them, if they are anywise true to the name of Disciple, or—should one say?—genuinely trying to be true. These are they who are seeking to be perfect even as their Father which is in heaven is perfect.

Contributions and Comments.

1 Corinthians xv. 32.

'If after the manner of men I have fought with beasts at Ephesus. . . .' The arrangement of the sentence suggests that 'after the manner of men' should be taken with 'I have fought' rather than with the following words, 'What doth it profit me?' It is difficult to catch the exact meaning of the phrase. St. Paul uses it six times in his Epistles: here and in 3^3 9^8, Ro 3^5, Gal 1^{11} 3^{15}. In three instances it is connected with 'saying' or 'speaking' to express the idea '*humanly* speaking.' In 1 Co 3^3, 'For ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying and strife and division, are ye not carnal, and walk *as men*?' *i.e.* as men considered apart from the Spirit of God, mere 'natural' men as opposed to spiritual men; and in Gal 1^{11}, 'the gospel which was preached of me is not *after man*,' *i.e.* not based on any merely human communication but given by God—the meaning is clear. It would seem that in St. Paul's mind the words imply a contrast between the ordinary human way of looking at things, and the way in which they should be regarded from the standpoint of the ideal. There is something almost apologetic in St. Paul's tone: 'If I have been reduced to this, to the sort of thing a man has to do when he is faced with wild beasts. . . .'

No doubt, as Dr. Plummer says, 'I *was* a *wild-beast fighter*' is metaphorical (p. 362). There were two classes of wild-beast fighters: the first *venatores* or *bestiarii*, men, rather like gladiators, trained specially to give exhibition fights; and the second, condemned persons, who, either without weapons at all or with altogether insufficient weapons, were thrown to the beasts in the arena, that they might be put to death and at the same time give excitement to the public. These victims were not intended to escape, and rarely did; and if St. Paul had actually undergone such an experience it would certainly have left some mark on Christian tradition.[1]

It seems clear, then, that St. Paul is here likening himself in his struggle with his adversaries at Ephesus to a *venator* fighting with wild beasts in the arena. If so, a recent discovery in Corinth itself adds colour to the Apostle's words. In the spring of 1925 some American archæologists in excavating the theatre at Corinth discovered a wall round the orchestra on which there were remarkable paintings of a *venatio*, *i.e.* a public exhibition of combats with wild beasts. The figures are life-size and are painted against a blue background, below which there is a band of yellow, lighter above and darker below, clearly representing the sand of the arena. Unfortunately, the top of the wall has disappeared, and only the bottom portion to the height of about five and a half feet from the ground remains standing, so that the lower parts only of the figures are preserved. Enough is left, however, to show that the original paintings were remarkably full of life and action.

Dr. T. L. Shear, who was chiefly responsible for their discovery, has given a most interesting account of them in the *American Journal of Archæology* (2nd Series, vol. xxix. (1925) pp. 383 ff., and vol. xxx. (1926) pp. 451 ff.), from which I take the following description. In one scene two *bestiarii* are engaged in a fight with a bull. The bull is richly caparisoned with a fillet round his neck, a broad green band about his body, and red discs on his side. With his tongue protruding, and his forelegs in the air, he has rushed to transfix himself on the point of a long spear which is held by a crouching gladiator, who has supported the other end of the spear in the sand of the arena with his right foot. As the gladiator is kneeling, his entire figure is preserved, with the exception of the upper half of his head. He wears

[1] Note especially the absence of any such adventure from the list mentioned in 2 Co $11^{23ff.}$

a short white garment, and is assisted by another man standing close beside him. Both have white bands below the knees and wear sandals with white straps. In another section of the frieze a *bestiarius*, by means of a long pole with its sharpened end thrust into the sand, has hurled himself over the back of a huge charging leopard. Both the man and the beast are in mid-air, with the *bestiarius* coming down behind the leopard, his legs close together in good athletic form. The leopard is painted a tawny colour and is covered thickly with spots, while the *bestiarius* has the red flesh common to all the bestiarii and wears the familiar white bands below the knees.

The scenes are full of life, and as the painting probably dates from about the beginning of the Christian era (*Am. J. A.*, vol. xxx. (1926) p. 453), some of the very Corinthians who read St. Paul's letter may have actually seen it. Possibly St. Paul had seen it himself. At all events it shows that 'beast-fighting' was associated in the popular mind with extraordinary physical fitness, alertness, and resource, on the part of the *bestiarius*; and such thoughts were very likely in St. Paul's mind. He was not, in other words, thinking of himself as a condemned person thrown to the beasts, but as a *bestiarius* hardened by long training; and it had been through quick and decisive actions involving a succession of the greatest efforts that he had been delivered from his opponents at Ephesus.

J. W. Hunkin.
Rugby.

The New Church Hymnary: Two Companion Handbooks.

For several years a joint Committee representing the Presbyterian Churches of Great Britain and Ireland and their offshoots in South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand have been engaged in the preparation of a new Church Hymnary. Last year a Draft of the results of much painstaking research was submitted to the representative Assemblies of the Churches interested, and was widely distributed amongst their ministers. Now it is published in various attractive forms and at popular prices as the official and authorized Hymn-book for use in public worship.

Two Companion Handbooks on this Hymnary have recently been published: a larger one by Professor James Moffatt, D.D., who has just gone to his new sphere in America, and a shorter by Dr. Millar Patrick of Edinburgh. These are now in our hands, and it has become our pleasant task to give some appreciation of their contents.

I.

In examining Dr. Moffatt's *Handbook*[1] we are struck at once with its remarkable fullness. There was no such help in the use of the earlier Hymnary. Apart from a few notes in a large-type edition, there was no reference to sources of information on the origin of individual hymns. But in this large book we find a clear, though concise, statement of the life and works of all those writers whose hymns are presented in it.

First of all comes an intensely interesting series of notes on the words and music of the hymns in order. As there are seven hundred and twenty-nine hymns in all, one can hardly even imagine the amount of work which this section exhibits. No doubt there are many books of reference which some of us have been wont to handle in our search for information concerning the source and form of particular hymns. Dr. Moffatt has had all of these through his hands; and now the best results of such writers on hymnology as Dr. Julian in the revised edition of his *Dictionary* (1915); the historical edition of *Hymns Ancient and Modern* (1909); Cowan and Love on *The Music of the Church Hymnary* (1901); and several others in German and French have been laid under our eyes.

Yet even this statement does not exhaust the riches of the compilation. A very large section is devoted to notes on authors, composers, and sources. If I want to know who Isaac Watts was, or Philip Doddridge, or Charles Wesley, or James Montgomery, or Thomas Kelly, or W. Walsham How, I have but to turn up the initial letter of his surname to find all that I need to know for the understanding of his hymns and even the kind of spiritual experience out of which those hymns were born.

II.

The second Companion Handbook of the Revised Hymnary has been prepared by Dr. Millar Patrick of Craigmillar United Free Church, Edinburgh, and is published by the Scottish Churches Joint Committee on Youth. The title of it is *The Story of the Church's Song* (2s. 6d.). In no sense is it a résumé of Dr. Moffatt's larger work. Although happily much cheaper in price and therefore more accessible to all who desire to use the Hymnary with intelligence and comfort in public worship, it is quite an independent work and is written throughout

[1] Milford; 7s. 6d.

with conspicuous knowledge of the whole subject and with highly competent care and judgment.

The book is divided into twenty-four chapters, and a few of the titles will indicate the wide range of information it traverses: 'The Church's First Heritage of Song: the Psalms' (ch. i.), 'Hymns of the New Testament' (ch. ii.), 'The Metrical Psalters of Scotland' (ch. xiv.), 'How the Psalters led the Way to Paraphrases and Hymns' (ch. xv.), 'How Isaac Watts opened the Sluice-gates to let the Stream flow free' (ch. xvii.), 'The Great Revival: The Wesleys and their New Song' (ch. xviii.), 'Some Distinctive Notes in Twentieth Century Hymnody' (ch. xxiv.). The book closes with a useful Bibliography on all of the chapters for more extended study.

In the midst of all his interest in purely Christian hymns Dr. Patrick plainly indicates that in the future development of Christian Church praise, the grand old psalms of the Bible are likely to hold—as so many of us feel they should hold—a far more prominent place in our weekly Sunday services of praise than has for long been assigned to them in so many quarters. What is needed above all in the hearts of our Church members is a praiseful spirit springing out of a quickened spiritual life. The motto of the great Revival of 1859 was: 'Let us bring up our converts on the Psalms.'

In the services of the Temple, and even so far of the Synagogue, 'nothing was left undone that the finest artistry of the time could serve to heighten the effect of such music as was within the compass of their resources' (p. 11). We of this era have resources such as the old Hebrew worshippers never dreamt of. Let us have a careful and reverent revision of our Scottish metrical Psalter with many diverse versions of favourite psalms, and no Christian assemblies in the world will have a more inspiring service of praise than we shall enjoy in our Scottish congregations. There is evidently a strong movement in this direction. In the Church where the present writer and his family worship, we have had within the past two or three weeks carefully selected portions of psalms sung by the choir and congregation to such fine old tunes as Torwood, Effingham, Coleshill, Invocation, and St. George's Edinburgh, with a spirit and a power which their rendering of ordinary hymns seldom approaches.

But to reach this most desirable issue and to receive much more valuable stimulus in life and service, this fine Handbook of Dr. Patrick should be bought and circulated in thousands in all our congregations.

J. P. Lilley.

Edinburgh.

The Rich Young Ruler.

Allow me to thank J. E. Compton of Colchester for pointing out the error in my article on 'Who was the Rich Young Ruler?' The only explanation is—that it was a pure oversight. But really, Mr. Compton's drawing my attention to it has set my mind working in other directions. And, for that also, I must thank him.

May I point out that the error does not vitiate the article. It is confined to one sentence only—'He is the only person that the New Testament calls "good"—outside Jesus.' Omit that sentence and the trend of the article is in no way interfered with—whether for reading or suggestion.

John W. Clayton.

Sunderland.

Ephesians iii. 8.

'The unsearchable riches of Christ.' Paul's adjective is ἀνεξιχνίαστον, 'not traced out.' Æschylus, in *Agamemnon* 368, used the verb ἐξιχνεύω, signifying something which might be traced out clearly. This usage of the word in the play, together with its context there, may illuminate Paul's usage. The Chorus is referring to the death of Paris. It pictures Jove as having bent his bow against Paris with such certain aim that the shaft neither fell before the proper moment, nor yet overshot the mark, but found its target with unerring precision. So it is with those who are destined to feel the stroke of Jove, the Chorus reflects. 'This we can clearly trace out.' But the riches of Christ, says Paul, are not to be traced out. Here, then, in Æschylus, is the idea of the deserts of man being meted out with inexorable certainty, the vengeance of the gods so unerring in its aim that it can be traced out clearly by mortal discernment. But Paul sees in Christ a revelation of the ways of God which so far exceeds mortal calculation in its riches that all such tracing out is defied. Such riches of grace are unsearchable.

R. E. Thomas.

Middlesbrough.

1 Corinthians xi. 10.

Mr. Morris, in the December issue, has raised a fascinating problem. It is doubtful whether the solution is to be found in the directions that he has indicated. Westcott and Hort included this

text in the Notes on Select Readings appended to their edition of the New Testament in Greek (vol. ii. p. 116), though, in their judgment, 'the text does not appear to be corrupt.' However, one may be pardoned for suspecting corruption, especially as regards the last words διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους. I hazard the suggestion that the true reading is διὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον. This is a pure conjecture on my part. It would be strange if it had occurred to no one before. If it is on record anywhere, I have not seen it. The following arguments, if not conclusive, appear on a conjunct view to carry considerable weight.

1. Palæographically, the difference between τοὺς ἀγγέλους and τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is small. Written in uncials unspaced ΤΟΥϹ and ΤΟΕΥ have three letters in common, while ϲ and ε are very similar. If the original exemplar were a little blurred, the effect might be to make ΤΟΥϹ seem the true reading; and, if the ΙΟΝ were hard to decipher, the scribe would naturally assume ΑΓΓΕΛΟΥϹ in agreement with ΤΟΥϹ.

2. A relevant meaning is obtained. The apostle has already used the phrase in ch. 9^{23} to express the dominant motive of his actions, and he might well believe that if the women of the Church were ruled by this motive they would recognize the propriety of wearing a veil.

3. It suits the context, both preceding and succeeding. The apostle has just said, διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα . . . διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα. Having said, 'for the woman's sake,' 'for the man's sake,' he now says, 'for the gospel's sake,' which is apparently more to the purpose than 'for the angels' sake.' Then πλήν introduces a corrective, lest his readers should think him untrue to gospel liberty in requiring women to wear a token of subordination. There is mutual dependence between man and woman 'in the Lord.'

JAMES P. WILSON.

St. Quivox, Ayr.

Entre Nous.

The Speaker's Bible.

Since we last drew attention to *The Speaker's Bible* three more volumes have appeared. The first two dealt with 1 Corinthians and Philemon. Now Acts is being covered in two volumes, and one of these has been issued (Ac 1.–xiv.). In place of a review we give below what 'The Methodist Recorder' says of this volume. It should be noted that a Prospectus giving full particulars of the work may be had from the Speaker's Bible Office, Aberdeen.

'Among helps for the busy preacher there is nothing to compare with "The Speaker's Bible," and its latest volume, the first of two to be devoted to Acts, is a very welcome arrival (Speaker's Bible Office; 9s. 6d.). It covers the first fourteen chapters of the book, and is so interesting that the present reviewer, intending no more than a skimming of its pages for the purpose of this notice, found himself held to them until midnight had gone and there was nothing more to read but the book's index. Principal W. M. Clow, D.D., of Glasgow, contributes the Introduction, and there are other signed articles contributed by the Rev. W. M. Grant, D.D., and the Rev. J. H. Morrison; but whether signed or unsigned all the contents of the volume reach a very high level, and supply a great wealth of suggestion for those who purpose discourses upon the great days of the Church's beginnings. No Article is without its meed of illustrative material, the very latest literature being laid under contribution; there being numerous extracts from the books of the autumn publishing season. Preachers with a library of sermonic literature at hand will find the copious index invaluable, and such as have no reason for making sermons will find the book a most inspiring devotional companion.'

Trust.

From 1912 to 1918 there was carried on in Dorset a certified reformatory with the title The Little Commonwealth. The Superintendent was Homer Lane, and he carried on the Little Commonwealth on new lines. It was co-educational and self-governing. Lane was a born educationalist, and his methods were strikingly successful. He had usually about 42 boys and girls whose ages ranged from fourteen to nineteen, a small number of young children and a few adults. The Commonwealth was divided into three groups, the 'three families.' Each person was free to choose which family he would belong to. Boys and girls shared equally in the responsibility of family maintenance and government, and they were responsible for the welfare of the younger children. Children under

fourteen spent their time between school work and recreation, but those over fourteen were citizens who were paid wages for their work and who provided their own food, clothing, and recreation. A small book which has just been published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin (5s. net) with the title *Talks to Parents and Teachers* gives the notes of some of Lane's lectures and some account of his educational methods. There is a preface by the Bishop of Liverpool, which states clearly and sympathetically the cause of the withdrawal of the Home Office certificate from the school in 1918—the tragedy of Lane's life. There was in Lane a naïve lack of worldly prudence. But the withdrawal and subsequent closing of the school were brought about not only by this, but also by misunderstanding of his whole character and aims on the part of those who made the inquiry.

There are several good stories in the book showing the methods that Lane used to free boy and girl delinquents from their misconception of society and social order. One is the story of Tim. Tim was fifteen years old and a burglar, and he was committed by the Court to the Little Commonwealth. Tim, Tim's mother, and Mr. Lane retired to the ante-room, and Mr. Lane determined to aim a shrewd blow at those feelings of defiance and hatred which had been accumulating in Tim's mind for years. '"Look here, old man," said I briskly, "take your mother home and come down to the school to-morrow. There's a train at nine o'clock, and another at one, from Paddington. Book to Evershot. I've got to meet the one o'clock train. If you come by that, you can drive over from the station with me; if you come by the early train, ask the way. Don't forget the station—Evershot." And I gave him a sovereign for his railway ticket.

'Tim's manner was a study during these instructions. At first he was suspicious. As I went on, and he realized that he was not to be "taken away," he looked amazed; when I placed the money in his hand, he looked incredulous. I turned away towards the door immediately, but I saw him look at his mother and I saw her astonished expression. The boy seemed to wilt; his muscles relaxed; he shifted from one foot to the other; he licked his lips and sniffed nervously. As I turned away, freeing him from the authority of force and mistrust and harshness, the true authority took him in charge. My hand on the door, I heard him say in a lovely, tender voice, "Come on, mum!" and saw him put his arm through hers and draw her towards the door. The expression on both their faces showed that many associations in the unconscious mind had that day been dissolved.

'When the one o'clock train from Paddington reached Evershot the next day, Tim alighted. As I greeted him he grinned cheerfully, and handed me some small change left after buying his ticket, saying: "The ticket was sixteen and sixpence halfpenny." I counted it and put it in my pocket, the lad watching me the while. "Right-o," was all I said. This little scene about the money was an important part of Tim's release. Boys do not like to be treated carelessly.'

A schoolmaster discussing Lane's methods with him argued that it was Lane's personality that brought the boy to the reformatory. Lane replied that he always brought boys by the same method, and it never failed. There was some quality in boy nature which responded to confidence and trust. '"That's your personality or gift or genius, or whatever you may call it," the schoolmaster replied. "Besides, it is partly luck that he came as you directed. Now, if I had given him a sovereign and said, 'I trust you to go down alone,' the chances are that he might still be smashing things up in London."

'"I didn't say a thing to him about trust," said I.

'"But you did trust him."

'"Yes, but had I told him so, he would have known that I didn't, and then he would not have come. When one says to another, 'I trust you,' it implies doubt."'

A Pilgrimage to Palestine.

Dr. Fosdick is almost as well known on this side as he is in America, and so it is natural that a British edition of his books follows rapidly the American one. This month *A Pilgrimage to Palestine* has been issued here by the Student Christian Movement (8s. 6d. net). It is thoroughly modern in outlook. We expect freshness from Dr. Fosdick, and we have it here. His plan even is not the usual one. As he says himself, 'he is not going to tell a travelogue nor to district a country.' He asks the reader to 'follow from the Hebrews at Sinai to the modern Zionist the successive eras of Palestine's story as they were illumined for us by our pilgrimage.' And so we follow with him the trail of Moses and the fleeing Israelites from Egypt to the peninsula of Sinai. In chapter ii. we join the Hebrew forces in imagination as they sweep in on Palestine. The next chapter is devoted to 'The City of David,' then one with the title 'From Gilgal to Galilee,' and, after another on 'Journeys to the Prophets' Homes,' we move from the Old

Testament into the New. 'When one has lived for even a few weeks in Palestine intent on following the Master's steps, every landscape becomes vocal with some news of him, and one understands the meaning of that Syrian Christian in America who says that whenever he opens his Bible it reads like a letter from home. The vineyards with their watch towers, such as Jesus saw, still are here; public, noisy mourning when death befalls still is a familiar scene; donkeys frequent the roads, piled high with grass which to-morrow will be "cast into the oven"; stones and flowers, grapes, thorns, figs, and thistles, which he used in teaching, are everywhere; and in innumerable small, revealing ways the land lights up the gospels.'

As we follow Dr. Fosdick in his pilgrimage we get with a curious vividness the impression of the moment on himself. Many examples might be given, but we might quote perhaps what he says of Shiloh, surrounded by its barren hills, open only on the south. 'There is no doubt about Shiloh's site; it is precisely described in Scripture, and even the modern name, Seilun, is only another form of Shilonite. One goes to it now by automobile and feels the profanation as he does so. By the north road from Jerusalem, past many a site made memorable by Saul and Samuel, we rode in an hour to the byway that takes us across the plain to Shiloh. The day we came, the Danish archæologists, who sank their first trial shaft in 1922, were in the thick of their excavations. As the long lines of Arab women carried up the dirt and laid bare the ruins, our eyes were among the first to see the uncovering of the ancient town. Already we could walk among Byzantine and Roman walls; and trial shafts, driven deeper, have brought up assurance that the houses of the ancient Israelites lie underneath. The eager, excited Danish scholar, who scrambled that day over the ruins and spent his energy alike in hard climbing and laborious English, even thinks that in some picturesque ruins of a Christian holy place near by he may be on the site of the old tabernacle where the Ark was kept. At any rate, the position is perfect. Somewhere near this spot the aged Eli waited all that fatal day for the sacred Ark that had gone down to battle. A long valley falls away in front and makes a perfect staging for his anxious vigil as he watched for the first sight of the distant messenger. Few places in Palestine can fit the Biblical narrative with more precision.

'We kept vigil with him there that day and thought of all that happened to the Ark among the victorious Philistines.'

There is no doubt about the site of Shiloh. Dr. Fosdick would not say as much for many others. The site of the brook Cherith, 'like many another piously identified site, has been made as accessible as possible, even though moving it from the east to the west of Jordan was necessary. Similarly, in Egypt, the site where Moses was taken from the bulrushes used to be uncomfortably far up the river from Cairo but recently has been moved down within easy reach of the tourist.'

But Dr. Fosdick's concern is religion. In the early chapters of the 'Pilgrimage' he traces the religious development of the people to whom 'so unique a consequence' came. Then come chapters following the Master's life and showing Him looming 'impressively real and commanding against the background of his native land, at the same time more human in the circumstances of his life and more divine in his quality of character.' It is natural that the book should be rounded off with an account of Christianity as it is seen in the Holy Land to-day. What a pitiful picture it makes of disharmony between the Spirit of Jesus and historic Christianity! Dr. Fosdick finds three dominant notes in the Christianity of Palestine to-day—monasticism, militarism, and mummery. For mummery turn to his account of the miracle of the sacred fire which takes place on the Saturday before the Greek Easter when the Church of the Holy Sepulcher is given over to Greeks, Armenians, and Copts. It is on that day the holy fire comes down from heaven, and blessings wait the fortunate folk whose tapers are lighted and whose household fires are set ablaze with the sacred flame. 'When at last those who have secured admittance through special entrances have found their places, the main doorway is thrown open and a shouting, singing mob surges into the church—already apparently filled—carrying cheer-leaders on their shoulders and both acting and sounding like nothing so much as college students celebrating a football victory. It is a wild scene to begin with; it becomes a mad tumult of song, shout, and violence as the crowd shoulders its way as close as may be to the Holy Sepulcher. As for the religious spirit of it, that may be judged by the song the crowd sings as it comes in:

> O Jew! O Jew! Yours is the feast of the Devil, but ours is the feast of the Lord.

'Then the procession of gorgeously arrayed priests, clad in golden-yellow robes, begins its laborious march about the Sepulcher. Chanting their liturgy, they make their way three times about

the tomb, but only with the aid of the constabulary which forces a slender pathway through the throng. At last the procession is ended. The aged high priest is divested of his outer robes and is led into the Chapel of the Sepulcher.

'Then one can feel the excited tensity deepen. In a moment the sacred fire will come. The crowds strain about the apertures. Individuals lose control of themselves and fight for better places only to be mauled by their neighbours or thrown out by the police. Let a man have what opinion he may as to the quality of religion represented here, it is surely one of the best mob scenes he ever witnessed. Suddenly, amid the frantic pealing of great bells, the sacred fire comes. A Copt seizes it first, doubles up over his flaming bundle of tapers, and, protected by a well-organized interference, makes a dash through the crowd worthy of a champion half-back. He carries his captured flame to the Copt shrine behind the Sepulcher and at once rapidly multiplying scores of tapers, lighted there, twinkle in the shadows of the church. Man after man of picked strength and speed lights his torch from the Sepulcher's continuing flame and makes his flying dash through the crowd despite strenuous tackling in the endeavour to steal his light. It is now a mad scene. The constables are everywhere stopping fights, quelling incipient riots, and one man who, over-excited, tries to crowd his way into the Sepulcher itself is hit once by a constable and does not need to be hit again.

'Meanwhile, from taper to taper the lights are spreading through the church. On waiting cords bundles of them are hoisted far into the balconies and up into the dome. The vast sanctuary, that at first was largely shadowed, now sparkles with myriads of multiplying lights. The effect is dazzling, beautiful, and one knows that in every direction runners are already speeding across Palestine to light candles in multitudes of shrines and to start fires on many a household hearth.

'Slowly the great crowd disperses. Some piously carry their lighted candles home. Some singe their hair on head, face, or chest, or burn themselves beneath the armpits with the sacred flame. Meanwhile, between Golgotha and the Sepulcher a group of Christian Arabs put on a spontaneous sword dance to the edification of the saints.

'And this is Christianity in the land of Christ!'

Western Literalism.

'One feels afresh how far from the real issue our Western literalism is when it takes from an ancient Semitic literature wonder-tales about the sun and moon standing still, or creation-stories about the making of the world in six days, or narratives of marvel and magic of any kind, and tries to pound and press them into scientific fact. Science is the one thing of all others that such stories most certainly are not. Indeed, science, as we understand it, is the one thing of which the Arab yet cannot see the first principles.

'Ask the Arab his explanation of anything and you are met, not with science, but with a charming, dramatic story, or a symbolic comparison. "What is electricity?" one Arab recently asked another. "Suppose," was the reply, "that you had an elongated dog, so long that from his tail you could not see his head; yet if you stepped on his tail he would squeal at his head. Well, electricity is a long dog; it can stretch from Beirut to Damascus, and yet when you press it in Beirut it is in Damascus that it squeals."'[1]

'We would see Jesus.'

'In Lent the children of our two elementary schools in this parish come to church for a special service each Wednesday, from 11.25 a.m. to 12 noon. On the Wednesday in Holy Week the subject was, "The Captain of our salvation." I quoted the question of St. Jude to Christ, and then said, "Children, why doesn't Jesus 'Treat us all alike,' as the saying goes? Why does He show Himself to some and not to others?" I hardly expected an answer, but a boy of about thirteen put his hand up at once. "Please, sir," he said, "He shows Himself to those who *want* to see Him." A wonderful answer, surely. And so entirely true.'

This story is told by Canon Peter Green. It is the keynote of his study of the Person and doctrine of Jesus Christ, the title of which is *Our Lord and Saviour* (Longmans; 4s. net). Let young men and women who want to know the Lord Christ read these suggestive chapters of Canon Green. The first step, he says, is to try and gain from a careful study of Holy Scripture a mental picture of Jesus Christ which shall do justice to all aspects of His Person and work. Here he makes a suggestion which was made to himself by G. H. Russell Garcia when they were up together at Cambridge. Mr. Garcia afterwards became a Congregational minister at Sunderland, where his all too short ministry ended. It was that he 'should read the Gospels for the first time.' One day Garcia said 'suddenly, apropos of nothing in the conversation we had been having, "Green, you were brought

[1] H. E. Fosdick, *A Pilgrimage to Palestine*, 137.

up in a religious home. Well! how would you like to read the Gospels for the first time to-day? If you came to them fresh at the age of twenty, what effect would they have on you? Would you believe them? And what effect would the central figure have on you? Would Jesus attract you, or repel you?" At the time the question merely gave me a nasty jolt. But I never forgot it. And many years after I was led by it to make an experiment. It must have been at least ten years after I was ordained, and I was going from Manchester to Euston on an express train. No sooner had the train started than I realised that I had brought no book or paper to read. And then Garcia's remark came into my mind. So I took out my pocket Testament and decided to read one of the gospels straight through, and to do it, as far as possible, as if I had never read it before. Of course, it is not possible entirely to get rid of the associations and presuppositions of a lifetime. But let the reader try the experiment.'

After the mental picture has been got Canon Green would have an attempt made to understand and interpret the teaching of Jesus, and then an attempt to apply it so as to realize the life of discipleship. Having got a personal knowledge of Christ, the young man must then face the question, What think ye of Christ? He must have coherent thinking of God; that is, he must have a theology. So the last chapters in the book deal with the Incarnation and the Virgin Birth, the Atonement, the Resurrection, the Ascended Christ and the Sacraments.

The Way the Gospel works.

'I had been preaching on the topic of the practical workableness of Christ's teaching, and then, a few days after, a middle-aged working-woman said to me, "I was getting on the tram yesterday, and I had a lot of bundles. The conductor was proper nazzie with me, and I was just going to sauce him back again, when I remembered what you'd said. So I smiled up at him and said, 'Aye, I'm a proper nuisance, loaded up with bundles the way I am, and at the busy time of the day, and all. But I'm being as quick as I can.' When I got off he called me Ma'am and helped me with my parcels, and said, 'We've a lot to put up with from some folks. One speaks hasty at times.' You see he was offering me a kind of apology. He'd never have done that if I'd been cross back at him. It's wonderful the way the Gospel works if you give it a chance."'[1]

[1] P. Green, *Our Lord and Saviour*, 38.

Mt. xxvi. 50.

Professor John Dow has an interesting note in 'The Canadian Journal of Religious Thought' on the cup which Jesus used at the Last Supper, in which he summarizes the theories of Dr. Deissmann and Dr. Rendel Harris. A number of glass cups have been found, dating from the first century, with the words running round them: 'What are you here for? Be merry.' A comparison with similar drinking formulæ upon other ancient cups suggests that possibly the complete sentence was, 'Comrade, what are you here for? Be merry.' Jesus did not use the words 'Be merry,' but otherwise these are His very words to Judas. The suggestion is that He quoted the words to remind Judas of the table-fellowship that he had so lately shared and to rebuke him gently for doing violence to the sacred ties that bound them. Dr. Rendel Harris has it that it is as if our cups bore the inscription: 'We'll tak' a cup o' kindness yet,' and Jesus touched cords of memory in Judas, saying: 'Is this your cup of kindness, Judas?'

'Comrade' was not the word that Jesus generally used, and it is quite probable that it was suggested to Him by an inscription. Dr. Rendel Harris conjectures that it was found not on the small cups out of which each drank—the type of which we have examples—but on a larger common cup from which the others were filled.

So Jesus took the social cup of pagan fellowship and hallowed it. 'That would be but in keeping with His way, to take the common objects of life and fill them with new meaning. Did He not take common human life itself and sanctify it? And it was no jewelled chalice or a rich man's ware that He honoured, but a plain glass vessel from which poor men had often partaken.'

Errata.

Kindly note that the publishers of *The Heights of Christian Unity*, by Professor Doremus A. Hayes, are the Abingdon Press, not the Student Christian Movement.

It should be noted that the *Liverpool Review* contains not sixteen but forty-eight pages of reading matter, although the price is only 6d.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In an attractive volume entitled *Current Christian Thinking* (Cambridge University Press ; 10s. net), Mr. Gerald Birney Smith seeks to interpret the leading trends of theological thought in the United States of America. But the subjects he deals with are also of vital interest to readers on this side of the Atlantic. Among them are Roman Catholicism, Reformation Protestantism, Modernism, Fundamentalism, the Appeal to Experience (Schleiermacher and his successors), the Appeal to Christ (Ritschl and his successors), the Controversy over Evolution, the Modern Quest for God (perhaps the most thoughtful exposition in the whole book).

It is a book which has interested us from cover to cover. Mr. Smith has an engaging and expressive style, and makes his points with precision. Of his theological competence there can be no question, nor of his close acquaintance with the movements whose history he records. In the course of his work he reveals his own standpoint, which is that of liberal or modern Protestantism, but he does not obtrude it ; his aim being to fulfil the rôle of the critical historian rather than to set forth his own views.

In this Note we would draw upon some of Mr. Smith's admirable chapters in order to bring out at once the likeness and the difference between Roman Catholicism and Fundamentalism. That there should be similarity between these two need not surprise the student of Church History, when he recalls that Reformation Protestantism did not emancipate itself from the mediæval spirit, and that Fundamentalism is an accentuated type of Reformation Protestantism.

What is it, let us first ask, that is common to Roman Catholicism and the Protestantism of four hundred years ago ? It is the appeal to Divinely established sources of authority. In the case of Roman Catholicism that authority is the Church. All Roman Catholic officials must submit to ecclesiastical authority or leave the Church. In the case of the older or traditional Protestantism the Bible is the Divinely established source of authority. But if a Protestant refuses to accept the teaching of the Bible, the Bible itself has no organ for discipline. So that Reformation Protestantism, as Geneva bears witness, had resort for the maintenance of discipline to the principle of ecclesiastical authority.

What is it, let us now ask, that is common to Roman Catholicism and the Fundamentalism of our day ? As Tennessee bears witness, it is still the appeal to Divinely established sources of authority ; and once again in the Protestant movement the authority of the Bible is buttressed by the authority of the Church. The Catholic programme of conformity to certain prescribed ecclesiastical standards is adopted, and an effort made to secure that all officials and missionaries shall submit themselves

to ecclesiastical censorship if they are to be retained in the service of the denomination.

It is here, however, that an essential difference between Roman Catholicism and Fundamentalism emerges. Fundamentalism is not the whole of Protestantism. While the fundamentalists advocate stronger centralization for purposes of discipline, the liberal or modern Protestants, who are out of sympathy with fundamentalist doctrine, repudiate their programme for the settling of disputed questions. Recognizing that the principle of the direct responsibility of the individual believer is incompatible with uniformity of belief, they are held together by a programme of voluntary co-operation. And so strong is the liberal or modern movement within Protestantism that Fundamentalism is not likely to have its way.

Mr. Smith brings his book to a close with a timely warning to the newer Protestantism. What, he asks, does the spirit of evangelicalism suggest? It suggests that a new theology is just as capable of religious barrenness as was the formal orthodoxy which the old evangelicalism confronted; and it seeks to interpret theology, whether old or new, as the expression of such a fellowship with God as shall make Christianity appear, not as a formal system, but as a Christlike way of living. Those who know the power and the joy of this way of life are the real representatives of evangelical Christianity.

A book which contributes at the same time to international understanding and scientific knowledge deserves a double welcome. This claim can justly be made for the volume entitled *Old Testament Essays*, published at 10s. 6d. net by Messrs. Charles Griffin & Co., London. It contains all the papers read at the eighteenth meeting of The Society for Old Testament Study held at Keble College, Oxford, from 27th to 30th September of last year, to which reference was made in the December issue of this magazine.

Scholars of many lands contributed both to the papers and the discussions, and any one who was privileged to be present could not fail to be struck by the international significance of a gathering in which representatives of many nations recently at war with one another met and discussed in the most amicable way the great literature which had brought them together. But it is to the contributions themselves that we now desire to draw attention.

In the opening paper on 'Prophetic Symbolism,' Principal Wheeler Robinson contends that the symbolic acts of the Hebrew prophets, which sometimes seem to us moderns so bizarre and trivial, were really performed—acts like the burying of a loin-cloth by Jeremiah, or his wearing of a wooden yoke to signify the subjugation of the nations to Babylon. These acts, which have their ultimate basis in primitive magic, become transformed by being taken up into the prophetic religion and linked up with the large purpose of Jahweh. They are not merely, as we are apt to take them, illustrations, but actual contributions to the realization of the Divine purpose. They bring that purpose nearer to completion, not only as declaring it, but in some measure as effecting it. Dr. Robinson concludes by showing that this thought, which seems so remote from our own world, has a permanent religious value.

Some of the points dealt with in this paper are treated again by Professor Lods in his paper on 'The Rôle of Magical Ideas in the Mentality of Israel,' in which he conclusively argues that the magical element played a considerable rôle in the life of ancient Israel; the smiting of Joash's arrows on the ground, for example, is conceived as having a real effect on the future. The efficacy of the spoken, and later of the written, word falls within the same circle of ideas. For the ancient Israelite, the cult was a sort of revealed magic, and one of the reasons for the prophetic hostility to the cult was, Professor Lods argues, its magical implications.

The vexed question of the Tetragrammaton is suggestively dealt with by Mr. G. R. Driver, who marshals the evidence from the ninth to the second

century B.C. furnished by various inscribed objects, the Aramaic papyri found in Egypt, the Assyrian royal annals, and some Babylonian private documents. The interesting results are reached (1) that 'the spelling of the tetragrammaton was purely a matter of fashion, which varied from time to time and possibly from place to place'—it might be יְ or יה or יהו or even יהה—and (2) that the pronunciation 'can be hardly anything else than Yâ,' a pronunciation which suits all the known varieties of spelling. The ה, it is suggested, in the longer forms יהו and יהה is merely a *litera prolongationis* to ensure that the *ā* was fully sounded; but when the *h* came to be pronounced—cf. possibly 'Abhrā(*h*)m—Jā(*h*)w (where the *w* was originally quiescent) became Jāhû. This is an important contribution to a difficult question.

Professor Obbink of Utrecht discusses 'The Tree of Life in Eden.' As against those who maintain that, before being driven out of Paradise, Adam had only eaten of the tree of knowledge, he argues that he had also eaten of the tree of life. Adam retained his immortality so long as he continued to have access to the fruit of that tree, but when he was driven from it, he became mortal.

In a paper on 'The God of Moses,' Professor Volz speaks in glowing terms of the historicity and the historical achievement of Moses. The Decalogue and the whole subsequent development of the Old Testament alike eloquently attest his greatness. The first commandment deals a deadly blow, by implication, at demon-worship and lays the basis for the conception of the unity of the world, thus delivering the ancient heart from the fear of the multiplicity of spirits by which it was obsessed; while the second commandment prepared the way for the appreciation of the spirituality of God. The Preface to the Decalogue presents Jahweh as the God of grace and of history, and the knowledge of this God is attainable by everybody, as the service of Him rests on the demands of conscience. Thus magic and priestcraft wither before Him.

In his discussion of 'The Paradise Story of Ezekiel 28,' of the essential part of which (vv.$^{12\text{-}19}$) he gives an admirable verse translation, Professor G. A. Cooke points out its relation to, and distinction from, Gn 3, Is 14, and the Adapa myth, noting that in the Ezekiel story, where the purifying process has not been carried so far as in Genesis, the privileged hero dwells both in the Garden of God and on the sacred mountain with the stones of fire, by which we are perhaps to understand the flaming ramparts which encompass the throne of Deity.

Professor Hempel, the editor of the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, subjects the Old Testament type of piety to a penetrating analysis. Without minimizing the contrast between the prophetic and the priestly type, he reminds us that there were analogous traits within these contrasted types. Both were inspired by feelings of terror and trust, of fear and yearning: the God of both was awe-inspiring and friendly; and in the cult, as in the prophetic experience, the awful God drew near. But the sorrows of the post-exilic period tended to push God back into the past or forward into the future; the cult did not invariably produce that immediate experience of God which is the heart's blood of religion, and experience tended to be replaced by dogma. Much thinking has gone into Professor Hempel's argument, which happily shows the deep affinities between types which have often been violently contrasted.

No question has been more hotly debated in recent years than the date and the implications of Deuteronomy, and to this Professor Eerdmans of Leyden, well known for his revolutionary Pentateuchal studies, addresses himself. In two important respects he allies himself with current critical opinion, maintaining (1) that Dt 12^{14} does not admit the assumption of various sacred places in different tribes, and (2) that the reformation of Josiah was based on Deut., a conclusion which 'stands unshaken.'

In a valuable discussion on 'The Unit in Narrative Literature,' Professor Eissfeldt urges that, important as has been the work done on the treatment of individual narratives, the time has now

come when we should give our attention to the larger contexts, which were to some extent lost sight of by earlier scholars. The individual narratives, as they now stand, often point both backward and forward to large literary units of which they now form a part, and increase our wonder at the broad conception of history already entertained by historians of a comparatively early period. Among many interesting points is that, in one of the documents lying behind the Books of Samuel, David is in the service of Jonathan, not of Saul.

Bauer and Leander's 'Historical Grammar of the Hebrew Language' is trenchantly criticised by Professor A. A. Bevan, who, in referring to the ancient vocalization of the Semitic languages, drily remarks, 'As for the pronunciation of the Amorites and the Ḥabiri, I must leave it to be discussed by those whose knowledge of the past is derived, not from documents, but from intuition.'

Dr. S. A. Cook, in a paper on 'Archæology and the Religion of Israel,' brings forward material, largely derived from numismatics, which goes to illustrate the analogy between certain aspects of foreign religions and features of Israel's religion which are preserved, or sometimes only hinted at, in the Old Testament. One of the most curious archæological finds is that of a zodiac on the floor of a synagogue—a find which, though resting on astral ideas, no doubt received a harmless interpretation.

Professor Causse of Strasbourg contends that the Jewish Diaspora was both earlier and more widely diffused than has been commonly supposed, and that it is a mistake to imagine that the exiles, for example, of the eighth century were lost in the surrounding heathendom without leaving a trace. There was a diaspora at many points in the then known world, and this diaspora, from which some of the literature unquestionably came, exercised a profound influence on Palestinian Judaism. Indeed, it may be said that the Jerusalem of the second Temple came into being as a colony of the Oriental diaspora, and the Wisdom literature of the Jews betrays an exotic, and more particularly an Egyptian, character. Thus, as the horizons of Judaism widened, any native tendencies within it towards universalism were strengthened.

A long and valuable paper on 'The Poetry of the Psalms,' by Professor Gunkel, deals the death-blow to the theory which for years has been dying, that the Psalter is entirely post-exilic. So far is this from being the case that, 'all things considered, we may say that Psalm-composition belongs to the earliest period of Israel's history,' like law, saga, etc. For in the pre-exilic period there was unquestionably deep religious experience and marked poetic power: what was to hinder that experience from being expressed poetically, especially in view of the far older Babylonian and Egyptian analogies? The demonstrable history of psalm-composition also points to an ancient origin.

Professor Schmidt raises the question whether there are in the Old Testament prayers of persons (falsely) accused of some crime in such a process as is hinted at in 1 K $8^{31f.}$, and he answers in the affirmative by pointing to certain psalms, cf. Ps $10^{7^{10}}$ 7^{2-7} 27^{7-14} and many others, from which it may be inferred that an accused person who was arrested and temporarily imprisoned might in the Temple assert his innocence by calling down a curse upon himself if he spoke falsely. The accused person was often also a sick person, whose sickness suggested to others specific guilt and led to a specific accusation. Hence it is that so many prayers of the type discussed are offered by sick men.

Dr. Oesterley discusses the thesis which he amplified in his recent book, that the religion of Israel affected the thinkers of other nations no less truly than it was affected by them, and from a comparison of The Teaching of Amen-em-ope with Proverbs he illustrates Egyptian influence on Israel and Israelite influence on Egyptian thought.

The book concludes with a very suggestive discussion, by Professor J. M. P. Smith of Chicago,

of the syntax of Gn 1^{1-3}, which issues in the following translation: 'In the beginning, when God created the heavens and the earth, the earth having been a desolate waste, while darkness was upon the surface of the abyss and a mighty wind was beating upon the surface of the waters, then God said . . .'

This objective sketch gives little idea of the richness and variety of the book or of the gathering whose labours it embodies, and the discussions which followed most of the papers were often as suggestive and valuable as the papers themselves. A record of them, had that been possible, would have considerably enhanced the value of a very valuable volume. But the volume, as it stands, will give Old Testament students much to think of for many days to come.

The Sermon on the Mount.

The Beatitudes.

By Professor W. M. Macgregor, D.D., Glasgow.

The Sermon on the Mount, as Matthew records it, is a greatly enriched and elaborated version of an earlier document which Luke seems to have reproduced (6^{20-49}) with little change. Matthew has worked into it a wealth of authentic sayings, many of which are found in other connexions in Mark and Luke, and he presents the whole as the first of five collections of the words of Jesus (chs. 5–7, 10, 13^{1-52}, 18, 23–25), which were, no doubt, intended by him as a parallel to the Five Books of Moses, the Five Books of the Psalms, and the Five Megilloth (*i.e.* Canticles, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther). These are not accidental or haphazard groupings, so each is concluded with the deliberate formula—'And it came to pass when Jesus had ended these sayings (or parables).' When the Evangelist thus brings together fragments of wholly separate origin (as where 5^{13-16} follows on 5^{1-12}) there is at least a presumption that he meant them to be read in sequence as throwing light upon each other. It is possible that he sought to give the Church merely a loose handful of precious stones, but it is more likely that in his own mind these were joined together in a construction.

Certainly in setting forth the teaching of Jesus he could not have chosen any word more profoundly characteristic than Blessed! for Jesus' distinctive message was always a *makarismos*—both a declaring and a making men blessed. Dr. Rendel Harris somewhere says that Jesus had the gift, even in saying Good-day, of making the day good, and this in varying fashion is recognized at the outset of each of the Gospels. Luke opens his account of the public ministry with the scene at Nazareth (4^{16-20}), where Jesus, in the synagogue, read from Isaiah the promise of a work of healing and comfort on the large scale, and then added: 'To-day this scripture is fulfilled.' To the same effect John begins his record with the symbolic story at Cana, where, at Christ's word, water became wine, stint was turned to abundance, and radiance and exhilaration flowed in. More briefly and bluntly, as his habit is, Mark makes the same point. He tells that Jesus began His work with the same message as the Baptist ($1^{4.15}$), only He set it to an entirely different tune; for, instead of John's thunder and alarm, Jesus came preaching the good news about God (1^{14})—that His coming to men means not terror and destruction, as John had conceived it, but far extended blessing.

It is not possible in one short article to develop the meaning of all the Beatitudes, but some of them peculiarly demand investigation, especially those in which Luke and Matthew come together, since their differences are instructive. Where Matthew speaks of 'the poor in spirit,' Luke speaks of 'the poor'; where Matthew has 'those who hunger and thirst after righteousness,' Luke simply gives the 'hungry'; and, with a charming departure from the conventional language of the pulpit, Luke reports—'ye shall laugh' for 'they shall be comforted.' Looking at the surface of the two reports, one might suppose that while

Matthew was concerned with spiritual conditions, Luke, at least in the first place, was concerned with material. So Dr. Colin Campbell (p. 217): 'The poor are blessed not because they are poor in spirit but because they are poor: the hungry are blessed and shall be satisfied with food because they are hungry. There is to be a complete reversal of fate, the exalting of those of low estate—the poor receiving good things, and those who now weep rejoicing over their altered lot.' That, as I think, is an overstatement; and yet no one who considers Luke's continuous sympathy with the poor as such will leave this element out of account. It is, of course, possible and even likely, that Jesus pronounced some of the Beatitudes on different occasions and in varying forms. But if we take it that Matthew and Luke derived this part of their Gospels from an earlier source, we may be confident in saying that Luke's barer form is the original, and that Matthew, in compiling his Gospel for the use of preachers and catechists, expanded some of the phrases so as to make Jesus' meaning plain. In Textual Criticism it is accepted as a general rule that 'the briefer is to be preferred to the longer reading'; and certainly in this case it is less likely that 'the poor in spirit' would be curtailed to 'the poor' than that the poor (a word which on its face challenges explanation) would be unfolded and interpreted.

How would this phrase 'the poor' be generally understood within the Palestinian Church? One lesson learned in the course of the Old Testament revelation was that outward prosperity or health was no sure token of the Divine favour. For a time it had been a part of orthodox belief that trouble was always retributive, but in the Book of Job that reading of the ways of God was indignantly and conclusively set aside; and, especially in the later Scriptures, 'the poor' are spoken of as virtually equivalent with the godly. Wellhausen (*Matthew*, p. 13) notes that 'already in Is 29^{19} 61^{1}, and in the Psalms, "the poor" has been sublimated into a religious conception; they are not merely people who have no money, but the godly who, in this world, are disenchanted and oppressed.' Poverty in itself, as we sorrowfully know, may be embittering, narrowing, stupefying; but those who heard Jesus in Aramaic using this word would inevitably import into it a secondary, ethical suggestion, understanding that it was the poor in this later Old Testament sense who were blessed. Thus, though Matthew's added words 'in spirit' are probably a gloss, they are a sound and intelligent gloss, which makes clear a great part of Jesus' meaning. It may be objected that such an added explanation would have been more naturally expected in Luke, writing for a Roman official like Theophilus; but, for one thing, Luke as a man of letters had a literary conscience, which inclined him to keep faith with the text of the document he was copying.

But more than this is involved. Luke, as has been noted, had an eager sympathy with the poor as such, and a glowing sense of the elements of revolution and upturn in the work of Jesus: 'He hath put down princes from their seat and hath exalted the humble and meek.' Now Jesus' original saying in its challenging bareness was susceptible both of the Old Testament meaning and of this New Testament revolutionary sense. Luke heard in it something like this: 'You, poor waifs and outcasts, against whom every door has long been barred, to you one Door is now open at which you need not fear rebuffs; and in that fact, you are blessed indeed.' Whilst Matthew exhibited the Hebrew meaning in clearness, Luke, with his keen sense of the revolutionary character of the Gospel, protested that he must stand by the Master's spoken word; and to make his protest emphatic, he inserted the corresponding woes (6^{24-26}). Thus we may note three stages in the explanation of the Beatitude—the naked word as first spoken by Jesus; the word explicated by Matthew in a religious Old Testament sense; and finally, the word reasserted by Luke without any explanation, in its half-defiant bareness.

The same difficulty arises in connexion with Mt 5^{6} and Lk 6^{21}: did Jesus originally speak of a 'hunger for righteousness,' or was His promise designed simply for those who are hungry—for the grim world of the unprivileged and the excluded? Again, as in the previous instance, there is Old Testament authority for the spiritual sense. The Lord 'satisfies the longing soul, and fills the hungry with good things' (Ps 107^{9}); 'the soul which goeth stooping and feeble, and the eyes that fail, and the hungry will give thee praise and righteousness' (Bar 2^{18}). Matthew thus did not need to seek far for justification of his expansion of the Lord's saying; but is this all its meaning? It is not without significance, that whilst Matthew conceives of the light as being kindled for 'all that are in the house' (5^{15}), Luke twice over (8^{16} 11^{33}) represents it as for *those who are entering in*. He has the urgent, pitying sense of people who are without, and who need to be encouraged with the promise of an open door and the guiding light. But if we thus recognize a twofold reference,

another question remains—what did Matthew mean by hungering after righteousness? Dr. Moffatt, following some good authorities, translates the word by 'goodness,' taking the Beatitude as offered to those who sincerely seek to become better men. This cannot be ruled out as impossible, though when in another passage (Mt 6^{33}) he translates righteousness by 'goodness'—'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his goodness,' he will find few to agree with him. John Weiss and others read the Beatitude in a Pauline sense, as giving assurance to the man whose heart's desire it is to stand right with God that he will not be disappointed. In the thirty-second Psalm the poet sings of the blessedness of the man 'whose transgression is forgiven, to whom the Lord imputeth not his sin'; but there is blessedness, says Jesus, even in the longing for such forgiveness and acceptance. There is substantial Old Testament support for this interpretation, as in Ps 24^{5} $132^{9.16}$, Is 54^{17} 61^{10}, where righteousness is used as an equivalent for deliverance or vindication coming from God. 'To hunger and thirst after righteousness' would be thus to long for acceptance and public acquittal from God, and that, clearly, is a possible and a worthy reading of our text. But the Old Testament also suggests one which is still grander. In Ps 51^{4} the poet makes his unreserved confession of fault, 'that thou mayest be justified when thou speakest and be clear when thou judgest,' for above all things he is eager that in the face of the world God should be seen to be righteous. So in Bar 2^{18} 'the eyes that fail and the soul which hungered shall give thee glory and righteousness,' *i.e.* shall confess that Thou art in the right. These men were concerned not with what might befall themselves, but only that God's name and character should appear without obscuration or disguise. It scarcely needs to be said that this passionate craving for a theodicy—the justification of God as utterly good and wise and righteous—has largely lost its hold upon the modern mind; and yet in age after age it has broken out afresh. In the Book of Revelation it finds ample utterance. After the eager pleading (6^{9}), 'How long, O Lord, the holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood?' there comes the triumphant outcry ($15^{3.4}$): 'Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty, righteous and true are thy ways, thou king of the ages. . . . All nations shall come and do homage before thee, because thy righteous acts have been made public.' That is a hunger and thirst after righteousness of a very noble, though it be an unfamiliar, kind; and though there is no room for dogmatism, the probability is that Matthew in his expansion of the Lord's Beatitude was thinking not so much of a man's desire for personal goodness as of his passion for seeing God gloriously acknowledged in His universe, or for that recognition and acquittal which is reserved for those who love Him.

The other of the Beatitudes which calls for separate note is the blessedness of the pure in heart: 'They shall see God,' says Jesus. The first suggestion for our ears and hearts is unquestionably of that immediate vision after which devout souls in all ages have longed; and in substance this remains central in the promise, whatever changes in the metaphor or the method may be involved. Philo speaks of those who persevere in their high quest 'until they see That which they have desired.' 'With the flash of one hurried glance,' says Augustine, 'I attained to the vision of That which is, and at last I saw Thy invisible things.' Repeatedly he deplores the shortness of these moments of seeing: 'I could not sustain my gaze: my weakness was dashed back, and I was relegated to my ordinary experience'; 'I could not stand still to enjoy my God, but was swept up to Thee by Thy beauty, and again was torn away by my own weight, and fell back with a groan into the world of sense'; on that immortal evening at Ostia with his mother he tells how the vision passed, 'and we heard again the babble of our own voices.' As this vision is the crown of our human attainment, so its brevity and transience are a constant burden to great souls: 'now we see in a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now we know in part; but then we shall know as also we are known.' And of this craving and contention Jesus says that satisfaction is sure for the clean-hearted: they shall see God's face. So much is clear; but the likelihood is that Jesus in the words He employed pointed His simple hearers to something equally simple. In 2 S $14^{24.28.32}$ 'seeing the king's face' recurs as a popular phrase for coming to his presence; and the same familiar metaphor meets us in the Psalms: Ps 11^{7}, 'Jehovah is righteous, he loveth righteousness, and the upright shall behold his face.' That is based on the practice of an Eastern court; and in word and idea it lies close to the saying of Jesus; so in Ps 17^{15}, and, with a slight change of image, in Ps $24^{3.4}$. And thus in this Beatitude a grave note is sounded. The Gospel assures the fullest chance even to the unprivileged and the outcast; but not to the neglect of character. This verse is one of Matthew's treasures; and it is not without significance that, later in his

Gospel, when he relates the Parable of the Banquet, though he is as liberal as Luke in representing the wideness of the invitation, he adds a fragment of another parable (22[11-13]). The summons is without restriction, to bad and good alike (v.[10]), but for every guest the wedding garment is required. Grace certainly is universal but not at the expense of ethics; and it is impressive to find this note struck even in the list of the Beatitudes.

One important general question is often raised about all the Beatitudes—Is their promise for the present or only for the future? Do they speak of a good to be awaited or of one which even now may be enjoyed? On the surface the future seems to predominate: men *will* be comforted and satisfied, and in view of this they can endure hardness. The present tense in vv.[3, 10] has no great force on the other side, for if Jesus spoke in Aramaic He probably would use no verb at all; and in any case, the present might be nothing more than a present of assured expectation. Claude Montefiore accordingly takes the futures as determining the whole passage. 'The Beatitudes show that the Kingdom at present is only a heavenly treasure, which as yet can only be hoped for, yearned for, believed in. The poor and oppressed are not happy now, they are to be accounted happy since they are heirs of a Kingdom which will assuredly be theirs.' This raises questions of the interpretation not merely of words and grammatical forms, but of the modes of Christian feeling. In his First Epistle (1[6]) when Peter says of the persecuted Christians that they 'exult, although now for a little while, if it must be, they are distressed by manifold trials.' Alford reads that word 'exult' in 'a quasi-future sense'; Blass calls it 'a present of confident expectation'; Windisch says that 'the exultation and the short-lived distress are not simultaneous.' But is that certain? Paul claims for himself and his fellow-preachers that though 'sorrowful they were always rejoicing' (2 Co 6[10]); Jesus declared that those who were reproached and persecuted and slandered for His sake were happy, and He bade them 'rejoice and exult' (Mt 5[12]); and Peter repeats the Master's word (1 P 4[14]), adding that 'the spirit of glory' rests upon all such. That note of victorious gladness sounds and resounds throughout the New Testament, which surely is the most buoyant book that ever was written. And Montefiore (p. 484) acknowledges this as fact, and says without undue regard for self-consistency: 'Whatever the reasons given for the assertion that certain classes of persons are happy, the emphasis lies here upon the fact that they are so . . . and in this present happiness lies the originality of these Beatitudes.' So the blessing, it seems, is not all deferred.

One consideration of weight may be added in view of the succeeding paragraph (vv.[13, 16]). Clearly it is possible that nothing binds the sections to each other, but it is likelier that Matthew intended or imagined a connexion. If vv.[3-12] are read in an exclusively future sense, without any present realization, how is any natural passage to be found over to vv.[13-16], which are directly missionary? But if the Beatitudes convey the assurance of gifts of light and health and satisfaction in this present time the sequence is obvious. In virtue of these gifts from Jesus, the Church possesses energies of infection by which the world is bettered. In opposition to any narrowly apocalyptic reading these verses present the world as having a future and as susceptible of improvement, whilst Christ's friends are thought of as having a function in and for the world, and a Divine equipment to match it.

On the detailed interpretation of the verses there is little need to dwell, for Christ's metaphors of salt and light and the hill city explain themselves. In spite of Job 6[6] and Rev 3[16] there is a touch of the comic in Montefiore's suggestion that 'as salt is to food in general, so should the disciples be to the world: they are to make it, as it were, palatable to God, by giving a higher morality and religion to the world.' That is scarcely an example of exegetical tact. Salt is that which hinders putrefaction, and its gospel analogue is meant to keep society sound and wholesome. But that function can never be discharged by men who have sunk to the level of the society about them. Holtzmann suggests that the saltless salt refers to the Dead Sea deposits, when the salinity has been washed out by heavy rains, and of this geographers and scientists may judge. But Christ's point is clear, that the Church's influence tells through its unlikeness to the surrounding society. Have salt in yourselves, He said again (Mk 9[50]). The same point is involved in both the other metaphors—of hilltop and lampstand. Jesus never counselled ostentation, but in good living there must be nothing timid or shamefaced. There is an element of the conspicuous, of marked and appreciable difference which He required of His followers, if their work is to be done. You must 'have your behaviour noble among the Gentiles,' says Peter (1 P 2[12]), 'that they beholding your good works

may glorify your Father who is in heaven.' 'The church of the living God,' says Paul (1 Ti 3^{16}), 'is pillar as well as support of the truth,' making it not only secure but conspicuous. A lamp is kindled in order that it may give light, says Jesus; and if we are entitled to read these two sections together, we must add that the secret of the radiant goodness which helps men thus is found in the present receiving of the blessings of which the Beatitudes speak.

Commentaries on the Old and New Testaments.

By Professor Arthur S. Peake, D.D., Manchester.

II.

I pass on now to speak of the commentaries on individual books or groups of books.[1] On Genesis the outstanding exposition is Gunkel's (*HK*). Adopting the accepted critical analysis, and indeed extending it, and at one with the Grafians in their post-exilic dating of the Priestly Code, he had a keen sense for the primitive features in the earlier narratives. He exhibited fine appreciation of literary values, remarkable aptitude for tracing the affinities and the developments of myth, a gift of penetrating and sympathetic interpretation. His commentary opened a new era in exegesis. Dillmann's work was learned, comprehensive, and laborious, but Gunkel far surpasses it in its faculty of entering into the thoughts and feelings of the writers. Holzinger's contribution to *KHC* was a very useful compendium, earlier than Gunkel but still worthy of consultation. It was strong in its critical analysis. The author has written on Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua in the same series. Procksch's Genesis (*KAT*) is more recent and is a good and thorough piece of work, though not in the same class with Gunkel. König published an independent commentary. The author is one of our most learned Old Testament scholars, a great philologist with an almost unrivalled knowledge of the literature of Old Testament scholarship, an adherent of the Grafian criticism, but much more conservative with reference to the historicity of Biblical narratives and the history of the religion than most scholars. He is apt to occupy too much space with polemic, sometimes on rather insignificant points. Our best British commentary is Skinner's (*ICC*). It has been much influenced by Gunkel, but is fully abreast of all the relevant literature. It is characterized by fine scholarship and great sanity of judgment. Driver (*West. C.*) pays much attention to the question of Genesis and modern science; but the notes are rather meagre, and the general standpoint is rather that of Dillmann than that of Gunkel. I imagine that the substance of it dates back to the pre-Gunkel period. Bennett (*Cent. B.*) and Ryle (*CB*) are both excellent.

Baentsch's Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers (*HK*) is a masterly work. Dillmann's Exodus and Leviticus has been revised by Ryssel and is full, accurate, and competent. Holzinger's Exodus and Numbers are worthy companions of his Genesis, and Bertholet's Leviticus and Deuteronomy (*KHC*) are also excellent. For Exodus and Leviticus in the *ICC* we have still to wait, but McNeile (*West. C.*) and Driver (*CB*) on Exodus are both valuable contributions, the latter being in my judgment much better than the author's Genesis. Bennett's Exodus (*Cent. B.*) is good but too brief. On Leviticus, Chapman (*CB*) is excellent. The book was translated and annotated by Driver and White in the *Polychrome Bible*. Leviticus and Numbers were combined in Professor A. R. S. Kennedy's commentary (*Cent. B.*). The author's great authority in Hebrew archæology lends special value to his work, but the commentary is too short. On Numbers much the fullest commentary is by G. B. Gray (*ICC*); but it may be usefully supplemented by Binns (*West. C.*) which is quite recent, and takes account of much work published after

[1] I use ICC for *International Critical Commentary*, CB for *Cambridge Bible*, Cent. B. for *Century Bible*, West. C. for *Westminster Commentaries*, EGT for *Expositor's Greek Testament*, HC for *Handcommentar zum Neuen Testament*, HK for *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*, HNT for Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, KHC for *Kurzer Handcommentar zum Alten Testament*, Mey for Meyer's *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, SNT for J. Weiss's *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, ZK for Zahn's *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*.

Gray's work was written. McNeile (*CB*) is good but rather disappointing in its brevity. On Deuteronomy, Steuernagel's new edition (*HK*) is an improvement on the old, which was written rather as a supplement to Dillmann than as a complete work. König (*SK*) contains much valuable material and a full introduction. Driver (*ICC*) is our standard work, resting largely upon Dillmann; but G. A. Smith (*CB*) is much more recent and very full and thorough. Wheeler Robinson (*Cent. B.*) was greatly hampered for space by the necessity of including Joshua in his volume. But so far as is possible the commentary is good.

On Joshua we have also Bennett in the *Polychrome Bible*, and G. A. Cooke in *CB*, in which series his Judges also appears, both of them excellent. On Judges we have two commentaries of the first rank, G. F. Moore (*ICC*) and Burney. The former is one of the most brilliant volumes in the series, and though published nearly a third of a century ago, still remains very valuable. The editor also undertook Judges for the *Polychrome Bible*. Burney's volume is very thorough and remarkably fresh. It contains a great deal of valuable historical matter ranging far beyond what would be anticipated in a commentary on Judges. The modern criticism of Judges, as of Samuel, owes much to Budde, who has contributed the commentaries on both books to *KHC*. Nowack has also done both books in his series with the competence we expect from a scholar so well equipped and experienced. Thatcher's Judges and Ruth (*Cent. B.*) is good so far as it goes, but is unduly brief. Ruth is combined with Judges by Nowack and Cooke. In *KHC* the five Megilloth are taken together, Bertholet dealing with Ruth. H. P. Smith contributes the Commentary on Samuel to the *ICC*, good but now rather old. A new treatment in the *Cambridge Bible* has been long overdue. A. R. S. Kennedy is the editor in the *Century Bible*. The length of the text has curtailed the extent of the notes. Specially valuable for its philology and textual criticism, and in the second edition for its discussion of topography, is Driver's *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, owing a good deal as most other modern works on the subject to Wellhausen's *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*. A parallel volume on Kings was written by Burney. It was a careful piece of philological and critical work but gave little promise of the qualities exhibited in his Judges. Skinner's commentary (*Cent. B.*) is as admirable as its limits will permit, and Lumby's contribution to the *Cambridge Bible* has fortunately been superseded by W. E. Barnes. Kittel's long preoccupation with the History of Israel made his choice for Kings and Chronicles in *HK* very fitting, and both books are also taken by Benzinger, the distinguished authority on Hebrew Archæology, in *KHC*. Kings is unfortunately still missing in *ICC*, but Curtis and Masden have contributed a comprehensive volume to the series on Chronicles. W. A. L. Elmslie has prepared a substantial volume on Chronicles for *CB*, including some material from an early edition by W. E. Barnes. W. R. Harvey-Jellie did Chronicles for *Cent. B.* In the same series T. Witton Davies took Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther, and the treatment is much fuller than in the preceding volume. Batten has dealt with Ezra and Nehemiah in *ICC*, and Ryle in *CB*, both substantial contributions. Siegfried is responsible for Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther in *HK*, Bertholet for Ezra and Nehemiah, and Wildeboer for Esther in *KHC*. Paton's Esther (*ICC*) is a solid piece of work. Streane in *CB* is brief but scholarly.

On Job, as is natural, there are several commentaries of outstanding quality. The older exegesis was worthily summed up by Dillmann. Duhm's exposition (*KHC*) was singularly penetrating and sympathetic, and his critical position seems to me generally sound. Budde's treatment (*HK*) was distinguished and fresh, but unhappily marred by his refusal to recognize that the speeches of Elihu constituted no part of the original book, and by the consequences of that refusal. In English our standard work is Driver and Gray (*ICC*). Special attention is paid to the philology. The exegesis is carefully done and the critical position balanced. The commentary by C. J. Ball is very learned; it is specially intended for Hebrew scholars. The editor's wide Semitic knowledge, especially in cuneiform, is much in evidence. Textual criticism has great prominence and is frequently drastic. Except for its sounder criticism, A. B. Davidson's volume in *CB* seems to me much inferior in quality to his earlier commentary, which, to our great loss, was never completed. J. Strahan's independent volume draws largely from Duhm and is a useful piece of work. Gibson in *West. C.* seems to me distinctly one of the weaker volumes of the series. Buttenwieser's commentary is learned and thorough; but his critical theories are very precarious. For the sake of completeness I may mention my own commentary in the *Cent. B.*

The Psalter has naturally attracted numerous expositors, but I find commentaries on the Psalms generally disappointing. Probably this is in the nature of the case. In English Cheyne (N.B. 1st

ed.), in German Gunkel, perhaps exhibit best the qualities which fit the expositor for this difficult task. Cheyne's commentary was written rather to supplement Delitzsch and Ewald than to provide a complete interpretation; but even so it remains a classic of exposition. Briggs in *ICC* is full and useful, providing a good deal of help for students of the original; but it was scarcely a task for which the editor was ideally fitted. Kirkpatrick (*CB*) is compact and reasonably full; W. T. Davison and T. Witton Davies in the *Cent. B.* are briefer, but good within their limits. Of Duhm (*KHC*) I have already spoken. Baethgen in *HK* was a thorough piece of work; it has been replaced by Gunkel. Owing to its extent the latter commentary was published without the Introduction, which is to be specially devoted to the study of the literary types in the Psalter. The first half of this has just appeared. Kittel in *SK* has found deserved acceptance. König has also treated the subject recently from his standpoint in a large volume.

Proverbs is a tantalizing book for the commentator. Toy's volume in the *ICC* is thorough and competent; Perowne's in *CB* is slight and not satisfactory, and Currie Martin's treatment (*Cent. B.*), while good and interesting, is limited by the inclusion of Ecclesiastes and The Song of Songs in the same volume. Frankenberg (*HK*) is excellent. Wildeboer (*KHC*) is not quite in the same class. On Ecclesiastes Barton (*ICC*) is learned and well balanced, the theories of radical dislocation (Bickell) and of successive expansions by different writers (P. Haupt, Siegfried) are set aside. Plumptre contributed a fascinating commentary to *CB* which has now been replaced by Lukyn Williams, in an excellent volume, which stands high in the series. Siegfried (*HK*) presents an improbable theory of the origin of the book; but it is a notable contribution to its interpretation. Perhaps the best commentary is the French exposition by Podechard, which is very full and thorough. The older view of the Song of Songs as a drama celebrating the fidelity of the Shulamite to her shepherd lover in spite of the blandishments of Solomon is maintained by Andrew Harper (*CB*), but rejected by Currie Martin, who expounds the now generally accepted theory of Budde that the book contains a collection of wedding songs, sung during the 'King's Week.' Budde himself has written the exposition for *KHC*, and Siegfried has followed the same line in *HK*.

Of British writers on Isaiah we are indebted above all to Cheyne. He returned to the subject in book after book. His monumental *Introduction* falls outside our scope; but his *Isaiah Chronologically Arranged*, his *Prophecies of Isaiah*, his contributions to the English and Hebrew *Polychrome Bible* constitute a notable addition to the criticism and exegesis of the text. His *Prophecies of Isaiah* presupposes Ewald and Delitzsch, but his notes are a landmark in the interpretation of the book. The *Polychrome* editions, especially that of the Hebrew text, contain valuable matter, but they are not on a level with his earlier work. The best complete commentary in English is the second edition of Skinner's contribution to *CB*. It is strong alike in exegesis and in Biblical theology. Whitehouse (*Cent. B.*) is good, particularly on the historical side; but it is briefer and less recent. Wade (*West. C.*) is also excellent. Gray (*ICC*) is, so far as at present accessible (chs. i.–xxvii.), the standard treatment of the subject. A new edition of G. A. Smith's volumes in the *Expositor's Bible* has just been published. In the main the author stands by the general position taken in the first edition in criticism and in the discussion of the Servant problem. A complete translation of xl.–lxvi. is given, and some account is taken of the work of scholars during the last forty years, though much less than I had hoped. In German there are several notable commentaries. Duhm's (*HK*), first issued in 1892 and now in its fourth edition, opened a new era alike in the criticism and the interpretation of the book. It has left a deep mark on nearly all the later literature, even where its more extreme positions have been rejected. I need not repeat what I said about his qualities in the first article. Marti has carried out Duhm's principles with more rigour than Duhm himself, and followed him very closely where he has not shot beyond him in his main results. He diverges from him on the Servant problem, defending rightly, as I believe, the identification with the empirical Israel. A much more conservative treatment is given to the problems by Kittel in his revision of Dillmann. König has recently published an independent commentary which takes its place by the side of his Genesis and Psalms. I have not thought it worth while as a rule to call attention to Strack and Zöckler's Commentary, but I might make an exception for Orelli's Isaiah and Jeremiah and Minor Prophets in their most recent editions. In French there is a fresh and suggestive volume by Condamin, laying special stress on a strophic theory. The annotations are rather meagre. I understand that a second edition is in preparation.

Jeremiah had been unduly neglected by British commentators till comparatively recently.

Cheyne's exposition in the *Pulpit Commentary* appeared more than a quarter of a century before my own (*Cent. B.*), which was published in 1910–12. Streane (*CB*) in its second edition marked a considerable improvement on the first edition, and Binns (*West. C.*) is an excellent piece of work written from the standpoint of Professor Kennett. I am not including translations in this survey, but an exception should be made in the case of Driver's *The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah* because it contains notes, in addition to the valuable rendering of the text. Germany has been especially fruitful from the time of Hitzig onwards. Graf's commentary was a great work in its day, and still, though nearly seventy years old, repays consultation. As compared with more recent commentaries it is astonishingly conservative. Wellhausen wrote no commentary on Jeremiah, but his remarkable study of him in his *History of Israel* opened the way for a new approach. Giesebrecht (*HK*) was the first in the series of recent great commentators, but in spite of his valuable pioneering work, I think that even in its second edition it scarcely reaches the level attained in some of his other books. Duhm (*KHC*) made a contribution of exceptional value to the estimation of the prophet and the interpretation of his utterances, but those utterances were sadly reduced in number in deference to his metrical theory (though less so than by N. Schmidt and G. Hölscher), and he was less appreciative of much that he regarded as later—especially the New Covenant passage—than could have been wished. Indebted though I was in the preparation of my own work to Graf and Giesebrecht, and still more to Duhm, I found myself much more fully in sympathy with Cornill's commentary, which ranks among the very best expositions devoted to any Old Testament book. If in some respects it falls short of Duhm it is superior in its balance, its freedom from arbitrariness, subjectivity, and rigour. This masterly work is a model of what a great commentary should be. And now Volz (*KAT*) has won a worthy place in this great succession; his commentary is specially valuable, both for his independent work and for the account it takes of developments since Cornill's work was published. A second edition is in preparation. In French we have Condamin's commentary, which I greatly value. Lamentations has often been included with Jeremiah by British commentators. It is so in *CB* and *Cent. B.* It still awaits treatment in *ICC* and *West. C.* In German excellent expositions have been supplied by Löhr (*HK*) and Budde (*KHC*).

On Ezekiel, Davidson (*CB*) and Lofthouse (*Cent. B.*) have written excellent commentaries; I have already indicated that Redpath (*West. C.*) entirely fails to rise to a great and difficult task. Of the German commentaries it is still worth while to mention Smend in the *Exegetisches Handbuch*. Cornill's *Das Buch des Propheten Ezechiel* is very largely occupied with the restoration of the very corrupt text, and in this respect his work was epoch-making. But it contains not a little valuable exegetical matter. On the exegesis three commentaries of great merit should be mentioned: Kraetzschmar (*HK*), Bertholet (*KHC*), and Herrmann (*KAT*). The book has till recently been regarded as lifted above doubts of authenticity. But several scholars have recently found considerable interpolations in it, and Hölscher has reduced the genuine element to small dimensions. His book is not a commentary, though naturally it contains a good deal of textual and exegetical matter, and the next commentary on Ezekiel will have to reckon very thoroughly with it. For this we in Great Britain look forward specially to Professor G. A. Cooke's long anticipated volume in *ICC*. Presumably it will represent a much less radical standpoint. It is unfortunate that Herrmann had not Hölscher's work before him.

On Daniel, we are now fortunate in possessing Montgomery's contribution to *ICC*. Excellent in criticism and interpretation, it is specially valuable for its treatment of the philology, which is unusually thorough. A. A. Bevan's volume was especially strong on this side, but important new discoveries have added greatly to our material for the solution of the problems. For the English reader the best and most comprehensive commentary is Driver (*CB*), and with this may be taken Charles (*Cent. B.*), which has behind it the editor's prolonged study of the Apocalyptic literature. On the conservative side, C. H. H. Wright was the author of *Daniel and his Critics*. In German, Behrmann wrote a fresh, learned, and independent commentary more than a third of a century ago. Marti's work (*KHC*) is excellent, though rather radical in its treatment of the text and too brief. If Behrmann could say in 1894 that on the philological side every commentary older than ten years was antiquated, much new material, especially the Elephantine papyri, has come to light in recent years, and the suggestions as to the pre-Maccabean origin of the narrative chapters has found fuller expression. On both these accounts Montgomery's volume is specially welcome.

It had been arranged that Harper should under-

take the Twelve Prophets for the *ICC*. He published only Amos and Hosea, but his premature death compelled him to leave the rest of the task undone. Professor J. M. P. Smith completed his commentary on Micah and wrote those on Zephaniah, Nahum, and Malachi. J. A. Bewer undertook Obadiah, H. G. Mitchell Haggai and Zechariah, and W. H. Ward Habakkuk. In the main, these commentaries are thorough. That on Habakkuk is an exception. The critical problems are extremely difficult, but the discussions of these and the exegesis are far too meagre. To the *Century Bible* R. F. Horton has contributed a sympathetic and attractive exposition of the first six of the twelve prophets, while Driver has dealt with the last six. In the *Cambridge Bible* the Minor Prophets have been dealt with by a number of scholars. Hosea and Micah were done by Cheyne many years ago, and have been neither revised nor replaced. But they have still a value of their own. H. C. O. Lanchester has edited Obadiah and Jonah, and adapted to the Revised Version Driver's Commentary on Joel and Amos and A. B. Davidson's on Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah. In the *Westminster Commentary* Edghill's Amos has been completed by G. A. Cooke. Its excellence increases our regrets for the loss of an accomplished scholar. G. A. Wade has combined in one volume good expositions of Micah, Obadiah, Joel, and Jonah. G. A. Smith's treatment of the Twelve Prophets in the *Expositor's Bible* was, I think, from the student's point of view an advance on his Isaiah. A new edition is soon to appear. It is an interesting fact that in the great German series the editor has generally reserved the Twelve Prophets for himself. So Nowack in *HK*, Marti in *KHC*, and Sellin in *KAT*. Great impetus was given to the criticism and exegesis by Wellhausen's *Die Kleinen Propheten*, a book valuable and suggestive out of all proportion to its size. Nowack was greatly influenced by it; indeed, his loyalty brought him some rude remarks from Wellhausen which were not unnaturally much resented. The third edition has been considerably revised. Marti's work was here as elsewhere on a high level of competence, but marred by his excessive radicalism alike in lower and in higher criticism. Duhm published first a translation, and then a short but important volume of annotations, practically passing over Habakkuk, to which he had recently devoted an independent commentary. Perhaps the most notable of all the expositions is Sellin's in *KAT*. Written with full knowledge of his predecessors' work, it is yet very fresh and stimulating, rich in the results of his own research, insight, and imagination. His work is indeed at times too imaginative; and while he holds his views with great confidence, he not infrequently changes them. Hoonacker published a learned French commentary twenty years ago, in the Roman Catholic series.

While I have limited myself strictly to commentaries, it is not to be forgotten that a good deal of exegetical work is to be found in articles and monographs. The very rich literature on the Servant of Yahweh is an outstanding example. Works on Biblical Theology and the History of Hebrew religion, special discussions of the doctrines of God and of man, of sin and salvation, of the Messianic hope and existence after death, expositions of Hebrew ethics, may all yield useful material. Biographies and character sketches of Biblical personalities may be found useful. But it should be remembered, on the other hand, that frequently the best contributions on any particular topic of criticism, history, or Biblical Theology will be found in commentaries.

Literature.

PUBLIC WORSHIP.

The conduct of public worship is a subject that is increasingly engaging the attention of both pulpit and pen in the non-liturgical churches. The Church of England has the matter settled, so far as the general order is concerned. It has its own problems, as everybody knows, but the 'Orders of Morning and Evening Prayer' decides many things for the Church of England minister. It is different in the Free Churches in England, and in all the non-Episcopalian Churches in Scotland. In all these bodies the conduct of Divine Service has been in the hands of the minister, and the whole atmosphere and arrangement of the service have been a matter of his individual taste and capacity and devoutness. The result has often been admirable when the minister is a good and able man. But when he

has been good but not able, the result has often been depressing. And in any case the fact that congregations are dependent on the condition and the devotional competence of an individual is not an ideal state of things. Hence the development in recent times of keen and wide discussion of the best ways to improve things. The privilege of free prayer is so precious that it must be retained. But how to introduce order and dignity and fullness of devotional meaning into the worship without a completely fixed ritual is a difficult problem.

The Rev. J. R. P. Sclater, D.D., of Toronto, was asked to deliver the Lyman Beecher Lectures on Practical Theology at Yale in 1927, and chose this as his subject. The lectures are now published under the title *The Public Worship of God* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d. net). Dr. Sclater is as qualified as any one to undertake the task. He was for some time in the Presbyterian Church of England, then in the United Free Church of Scotland, and is now minister of the Old St. Andrew's Church, Toronto. He has thus had a wide experience. He is also a man of his time. And he has been a very successful and popular preacher.

It would in any case be interesting to hear what such a minister has to say on the conduct of public worship. And, happily, Dr. Sclater resolved at the outset to keep close to his own experience and give us what he had learned in his various pastorates. The result is a book which ministers will read with profit, however much they may differ from the lecturer. And no doubt many will differ. To take one instance, we very much question the validity of his psychology of the ordinary worshipper. He takes the religious movement of the race as a whole, as displayed in the Bible, as his guide, and then he thinks we should pass in the service from fear to awe, from awe to joy, and from joy to love. Is this sound? Surely we do not need to go back to the beginning of the religious development at every service. We live in the light and joy of what Christ has brought. And many people will claim that the very keynote and exordium of all worship now must be Praise.

However, that is a detail. There are many valuable things said here which will help the preacher if he will listen to them. One is the insistence on the observance of the Christian Year. Another is the statement that Holy Communion ought to be either very seldom or every Sunday. The observance once a month or once a quarter 'falls between two stools.' Another is the reminder of the absolute necessity for the preacher of close contact with his people. In these, and many other ways, Dr. Sclater gives us wise and fruitful counsel. A man of his resilient personality could not help being provocative, and he trails his coat often enough to invite a controversy. But his book is both suggestive and helpful, and will do a great deal of good in promoting a more reverent and orderly conduct of the worship in the sanctuary.

AN EARLY APOLOGIST.

It is one of the best results of modern scholarship that a most interesting and valuable ancient writer has been rescued from the obscurity of ages and restored to the place which his merits deserve. The dialogue Octavius by Minucius Felix is one of the best of the early Apologies, and much better than some that appeared later. The writer of it is the most elegant of early ecclesiastical authors, and none discerned more clearly the fundamental issues that lay between Christianity and the serious elements of ancient religious thought. We cordially recommend this handsome volume — *Minucius Felix and his Place among the Early Fathers of the Latin Church*, by the Rev. H. J. Baylis, M.A., D.D. (S.P.C.K.; 15s. net). It is a very scholarly work. The translation is felicitous, and the discussion as to whether Minucius or Tertullian wrote first is ably, and we think convincingly, conducted to the conclusion that the prime place goes to Minucius.

We congratulate the S.P.C.K. very gratefully and very cordially on this fine enterprise which is bringing to the knowledge of modern students so many of the valuable works of antiquity which were practically inaccessible.

THEISTIC MONISM.

What is the relation between our minds and our bodies? Mr. Joseph Evans, M.A., in his book *Theistic Monism* (Macmillan; 12s. 6d. net), thinks that if we could answer this question we should get a solution of all our problems—our views of 'religion, morals, and education,' of God, freedom, and immortality.

He therefore applies himself to his work with the sense of a high vocation. Whatever view we may have of his conclusions, we honour the seriousness and solemnity with which he investigates and seeks to solve his problem. He reviews all the different theories with great knowledge, fairness, and critical acumen—Materialism, Parallelism, Interactionism, Spiritualism—and finding them each in turn defective and unsatisfactory, reaches a monistic theory in the light of which he expounds the great

problems of God, freedom, life, and destiny. Here we have an attempt to rehabilitate pantheism in its best sense, but a pantheism with a very decided dip towards materialism. 'Consciousness is a state of the living organism. It depends entirely upon the co-ordination of physical forces. Psychical process is after all physical process, since the successive modes of the conscious state are due to changes of co-ordination of the physical forces' (p. 166). 'Consciousness cannot be credited with activity . . . there is but one process of change—that which we call the physical' (p. 192), 'the mind is a part of the body.' Sentences like these abound throughout the volume, not as accidental accretions to the author's reasoning, but as forming the very staple of his argument, and we find difficulty in distinguishing this from materialism.

The author maintains that our views of matter have changed, that scientists are considering the universe as a system of energy, and that there is nothing in the nature of this energy inconsistent with the possibility of the evolution of a conscious being within and from it, and he concludes: 'If these positions are sound there is but one system of energy concerned, *that which we call physical*—and the dualism of mind and body has disappeared' (p. 297). Most men will feel that this is a very heavy price to pay to lay the ghost of dualism; and they will be less disposed to accept the offer when they realize the consequences. One of these is stated as follows: 'This leads us to believe that all which appears to us as evil would be found to be quite reasonable could we view it *sub specie aeternitatis*' (p. 300)—a conclusion which makes shipwreck on the moral consciousness of man. After all is said, there are sins and crimes which no species of *aeternitas* can justify; and a theory that leads to such a conclusion has got into some kind of false bypath.

Another consequence is stated as follows: 'If there were a heaven it would have to be sufficiently related to this realm to admit of our passage from the one to the other. And if it were so related this realm would not be a universe: it would not turn as a unit self-contained and self-sufficient' (p. 312). So in order to keep inviolate the great doctrine of the conservation of energy immortality must go, unless indeed—which seems unlikely—psychical research will find this heaven for us.

Such are some of the conclusions that do accompany and flow from the theory of theistic monism elaborated in this volume, and after paying our tribute of admiration to the learning and reasoning of the book we feel inclined to say *Non liquet*—not proven.

THE CHURCH OF TO-DAY.

Mr. Bruce Barton has followed up his two previous books, 'The Man Nobody Knows' and 'The Book Nobody Knows,' with a third which ought to have been called 'The Church Nobody Knows,' but is actually called *What Can a Man Believe?* (Constable; 3s. 6d. net). This book has been written in response to a truculent letter the author received from a business friend who challenged him to write an honest book which would answer five questions: (1) Would the world be better or worse off if it should abolish religion? (2) Has the Church done more harm than good? (3) Of the various religions now extant, which is the best? (4) What few simple things, if any, can a business man believe? (5) If there is to be a 'faith of the future,' what kind of faith will it be?

The book follows these lines, and answers these questions. The popularity of the previous volumes will secure Mr. Barton a wide hearing. And this is all to the good. For his book is essentially an orthodox defence of the Christian faith and (with all deductions) of the Christian Church. He has no difficulty in showing, for example, that as a mere matter of fact the Church salvaged what was precious in the old days to found a new civilization, that it has been the fount of faith and courage and kindness and hope to countless millions, that all through it has inspired the finest characters, that it has given us democracy, and education, and the higher feelings on which all social work for the oppressed has been founded, and finally, that it is the one institution to-day that helps to make men dissatisfied with themselves and aim at higher things.

Similarly Mr. Barton has no difficulty about which is the best religion. It is rather surprising for that very reason that, when he comes to state the 'few simple things' a business man can believe, he confines himself to what may be called natural religion and makes no mention of Christ. Perhaps this was deliberate and meant to outline merely the essentials of all religion. But it is inadequate from a Christian point of view. However, we need not grumble too much, for the book before us, slight as it is, contains excellent apologetic, and that of the kind that will appeal to the modern business man. The book is to be received with gratitude. It is unconventional. It is on very 'popular' lines. All the better. It will be read by thousands who will not look at a heavier and more complete defence of religion. The book can do nothing but good. And if its view of the Church of to-day is in many ways unfavourable, the author

at least gives us his own suggestions for a better Church. There is a fine honesty about the book that is attractive.

ST. PAUL AND PAGANISM.

St. Paul and Paganism (T. & T. Clark; 10s.), by the Rev. Thomas Wilson, B.D., Minister of the Parish of Stow, Midlothian, comprises the Gunning Lectures delivered at the University of Edinburgh in 1926. The 'pagan background' of the New Testament has been yielding up many of its secrets to the diligent research of our generation, and, as a consequence, offers almost year by year an ever-increasing field of study. Mr. Wilson has not been deterred by the already great magnitude of the field, but has closely followed the work of the investigators, and has succeeded in presenting to us a clear, interesting, and up-to-date account of their positions and conclusions. For this we are greatly indebted to him; and this, rather than the thesis he supports, constitutes the chief value of his book.

What is the thesis? It is neither the view that St. Paul was quite independent of his pagan environment, nor the view that his theology was wholly determined by it, but the middle view (such as is advocated by Professor H. A. A. Kennedy) that St. Paul and his theology can be properly appreciated by us only if we are acquainted with the beliefs and practices of the contemporary paganism. It is a reasonable enough thesis; the difficulty is to estimate the amount of the pagan influence, and, in particular, how far a parallelism of terms points to a real interconnexion of ideas and customs. In matters sacramental, for instance, Mr. Wilson allows that Christianity was only a new current in the mighty river, a higher branch in the great tree, of the general religious life of humanity. But even so, it is far from easy to define the new and higher element in Christianity, and this difficulty is patent throughout Mr. Wilson's volume.

While the volume treats of the pagan environment generally, it is particularly informative on some subjects that have hardly as yet been sufficiently popularized, such as the Hermetic Literature and the Pagan Guilds. Due space is given to the conception of the Saviour, and to matters sacramental and eschatological. References to authoritative writers such as Bousset, Cumont, Farnell, and Poland, not to speak of Dr. Charles and Dr. Milligan, are carefully made, but the notes so frequently following upon the references tend to be overloaded and to distract the mind of the reader from the particular subject under discussion.

In a concluding chapter, treating of St. Paul and the Modern Mind, Mr. Wilson contends, with no little eloquence, that the modern Christian who has imbibed the spirit of St. Paul is assured that in God all apparent contradictions are ultimately reconciled, and that the way towards realizing this is life in the Holy Spirit.

THE NEW LUTHER.

We are glad to receive the second volume of Professor James Mackinnon's great work on Luther —*Luther and the Reformation*, vol. ii.: 'The Breach with Rome' (Longmans; 16s. net). It covers only four years of the Reformer's life, but those years were of critical importance. Under Dr. Mackinnon's guidance we are enabled to trace the mind of Luther slowly, reluctantly, but surely, reaching the point of breach with the old Church.

The chief value of the first volume lay in correcting some common misunderstandings as to Luther's youth and monastic period. The chief merit here is that we are now presented in English with a much fuller exposition of Luther's positions than ever before.

The author will, we think, command the assent of his readers in the views he takes on all disputable points of any importance. Whether that be so or not, the means for arriving at a sober judgment is fully provided.

INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

There is no lack of good Introductions to the Old Testament on thoroughly modern lines: the peculiarity of Dr. Harlan Creelman's *Introduction to the Old Testament* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net) is that it is, as the sub-title indicates, 'chronologically arranged.' The chronological allocation of some of the detail is, of course, notoriously problematic, but Professor Creelman is justified in claiming that there is practical agreement among scholars with regard to the *leading* questions of the date and sources of Old Testament books. Many obvious advantages accrue from the chronological arrangement of the Biblical material: on the one hand one can trace more readily the history of Hebrew literature and watch how that literature is modified by the changing experiences of the people, while on the other hand one can note the wide variety of literary types within the same period. This book,

which rests on a wide and accurate knowledge of the modern literature on the Old Testament, will be of great value to all who are interested in the literary history of the Old Testament. It represents in the main the cautious critical standpoint of Hastings' Dictionary, so that its readers may be assured that they are not being led into indefensible extravagances. This volume first appeared eleven years ago, but it well deserves to be reprinted.

THE LAST QUARTER-CENTURY.

Religious Thought in the Last Quarter-Century, edited by Mr. Gerald B. Smith (University of Chicago Press ; 15s. net), ought to prove of considerable value as a book of reference, though the price is rather stiff for a book of two hundred odd pages. It contains a series of eleven articles, written by eminent American scholars, which were published in 1926 in the 'Journal of Religion.' 'In these articles the attempt was made to survey the progress of scholarship during the quarter-century just ended, and to indicate some of the important questions which are now engaging the attention of scholars.' The survey is limited in two respects. For the most part it takes account only of Protestant thought. In this connexion it may be remarked that two of the most readable articles deal with the Interpretation of Protestantism and Thought concerning Protestant Foreign Missions. Several of the articles, also, are expressly limited to American thought. These deal with such topics as Theological Thinking in America, Psychology of Religion, American Preaching, and the Development of Social Christianity in America. A wider outlook, however, is taken in the articles dealing with Old Testament Interpretation, The Life of Jesus, Early Christianity, and the History of Religions.

It may be said without qualification that in every case the work is done with great thoroughness and a wonderful degree of lucidity, considering the necessarily severe compression. The notes and comments on the literature are specially praiseworthy. 'Since it was impossible to present an exhaustive list of the publications during the quarter-century, the authors were asked to cite only what they regarded as the really significant contributions.' This editorial instruction the various writers have carefully observed, with the result that each article is a valuable guide to the bibliography of the topic dealt with. The whole work is a credit to American scholarship.

Thinking Aloud (Allen & Unwin ; 4s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Harold Anson, of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, London, is a series of lectures given recently at Leeds University on the invitation of the Vice-Chancellor. Dealing with subjects of current interest, such as authority in religion, the idea of the infinite, the nature of man, religion and secular life, prayer, psychical research, they aim at leading men, amid the difficulties and perplexities of modern life, to an assured faith in the good purpose of God. Clear, fresh, attractive, and persuasive, they are well calculated to fulfil their aim, especially among those who are ready to find the real test of Christianity in the practical application of its principles. Mr. Anson makes good use of such recent works as General Smuts's 'Holism' and Professor Whitehead's 'Science and the Modern World.'

The Rev. Frederick A. M. Spencer, B.D., has already written a book on the Ethics of the Gospel, and now he has published a sequel to it in which he professes to develop a more systematic application of Christ's teaching to the problems of society. The new volume is entitled *Civilization Remade by Christ* (Allen & Unwin ; 7s. 6d. net). But it is by no means a systematic treatise on Christian Social Ethics. All that may be allowed is that it seeks to apply Christ's moral teaching to a number of social subjects, among which are included war and peace, government and politics, the treatment of criminals, the use of money, marriage and the family, the eugenic problem, class distinctions. It is, however, a useful book. With a crisper style and a more penetrating treatment it would have been a more attractive book. Yet we appreciate the author's sensible outlook upon social questions.

Dr. W. Y. Fullerton stands in the apostolic succession of Spurgeon, whose biographer he is, and he is a preacher who knows his message and can deliver it with power. In *Souls of Men* (Carey Press ; 4s. net) he deals with 'the problems of the Church of to-day.' It is a heartening book, which ought to be put into the hands of every minister. Its criticisms are incisive but charitable, and its general tone is positive and constructive. Preach the gospel, is Dr. Fullerton's message, and preach for conversions. He would have us 'stop our crazy attempt to entice people into the church by amusing them, of weaning them from the world by offering them an inferior imitation of things which are provided much more successfully outside.' He has many pungent things to say about

preaching in church and in the open air, about mission work at home and abroad, about the training of the young in home, school, and church. Finally he is animated by a courageous hope that the Church's extremity will prove to be God's opportunity, and that we are on the eve of great things.

The Rev. H. L. Creager, B.D., and the Rev. Professor Herbert C. Alleman, D.D., of Gettysburg, have collaborated in the production of a *Beginners' Hebrew Grammar* (Heath & Co., New York; $3.00). This book is distinguished from most of the existing Hebrew Grammars in three ways: (1) The sentences set for translation are, for the most part, not based upon Biblical texts; (2) the various so-called 'voices' of the Hebrew verb are brought together, and the corresponding parts of each 'voice' are presented within the same paragraph; and (3) the irregular verbs are taught on the basis of fictitious forms modelled, as closely as may be, on the analogy of קטל. We cannot think that, in any one of these directions, this Grammar is an improvement on those in common use; for (1) after all, it is with *Biblical* language that most students desire to become acquainted; (2) the other voices can be easily learned after the Qal has been thoroughly mastered, and it is therefore better first presented independently; and (3) it hardly seems wise to bring before the students' eyes artificial words like חטל, קטה, יטל, קול, etc., when the grammatical forms of real words can be just as easily learned. Nor does it seem reasonable to introduce into Hebrew sentences set for translation the *plural* of לבב (Hebrew says 'their *heart*' rather than 'their *hearts*') or the extremely rare word קטל (cf. pp. 176, 192). This is not the best way to acquaint beginners with normal Hebrew idiom.

An excellent popular account of the history of the Church throughout the ages, arranged as lessons for a Sunday school, has been written by the Rev. T. G. Platten, M.A., Chaplain to the Bishop of Wakefield. It is called *The Growth of the Kingdom*: Lessons on Christian History (Heffer; 4s. 6d. net, paper 3s. 6d. net). It will carry the teacher through a whole year, allowing for holidays and some other interruptions. The story is divided into four parts—the Early Church, the Dark Ages, the Middle Ages, and Modern Times. There are forty chapters or 'Lessons,' and they are written in easy, flowing style which makes them pleasant to read. There are two features of the Lessons that are specially commendable. The writer knows his subject from A to Z. And he is a man of broad outlook and with a modern standpoint. His admirable treatment of Pentecost is an outstanding example of how such a narrative should be given to young people. We have tested the Lessons at various critical points, and we have nothing but praise for them. Teachers of any church can make good use of the book, and we warmly commend it to any who are looking for a course that will at once enlighten and interest their scholars.

Robertson Nicoll once wrote that he wished some one would write really worthily of the future life and the Christian conception of it. Nearly all the books on it, he said, are poor and vulgar. Yet they almost never fail to win an audience; and a great future is waiting for the real book when it comes; for sorrow is everywhere; and death passes no door for very long. Well, here is a fine little work, *The Life Eternal: Here and Now*, by the Rev. Alexander Nairne, D.D., Canon of St. George's, Windsor, and Regius Professor of Divinity, Cambridge (Longmans; 3s. 6d. net).

It is not *the* book yet. But the last adjectives to be applied to it are 'vulgar' and 'unworthy.' A reverent, humble, devout study, meant to help hurt hearts round about us, it will not be in vain. Certain it is that our whole conception of death is radically unchristian. People, says Dr. Nairne, are in their dark days too often, at best, 'resigned but unhappy.' What he tries to do for us is to show that we can 'pass out of death into life, here and now, if we love the brethren'; that the communion of saints can be the surest and most glorious of facts, and that John brings that 'into the foreground of experience, and offers abundant life and happiness which mortality does not impair; it becomes rather a means of fuller life than a fatality of separation.'

The Great Reality, by the Right Rev. G. H. S. Walpole, D.D. (Longmans; 6s. 6d. net), is an ardent appeal for the realization of the constant presence of the indwelling Christ in the hearts and lives of His people. The modern Church, with all its intellectual keenness and religious activities, shows itself sadly lacking in the one thing needful. 'If a primitive Christian were visiting the Church to-day, his chief complaint everywhere would be expressed in the word "insipidity." The salt has lost its savour.' The various chapters of this book seek to show how the great reality is to be

sought and found. While Bishop Walpole has naturally the strongest conviction of the value of the Eucharist for making the presence of Christ a reality to the believing soul, he sets forth very cogent reasons from history and experience against the practice of reservation. The main part of the book is occupied with wise Christian counsels for the cultivation of the inner life. They are the mature thoughts of an experienced spiritual guide and may be read with profit by members of all communions.

Books on prayer of a devotional nature have a large public of their own. *Effectual Fervent Prayer*, by the Rev. Gordon B. Watt (Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net), belongs to this class, and it contains a dozen or so chapters of earnest meditations on different aspects of the prayer life. The treatment always keeps close to the Word for its basis, but the appeal is strengthened by the writer's fervent spirit, and the thought is never cheap or trivial. We commend the book to those who are looking for a devotional companion in the closing days of Lent.

The Very Rev. R. O. P. Taylor, Vicar of Ringwood, has issued another volume of the devotional type, entitled *How You May Know God* (Nisbet; 5s. net). It is marked by the simplicity, sincerity, and sensitive piety to which his readers are accustomed. Its object is to show men that they have spiritual senses as trustworthy as their physical senses, and further, that their spiritual senses may be cultivated to higher issues than they themselves are apt to imagine. We may know God, says the author, in places of worship, on the hills, through our ideals, because of the existence of love in us, and in other ways besides.

Magic Ladakh, by 'Ganpat' (Seeley, Service; 21s. net), is hardly a self-explanatory title. The author is Major M. L. A. Gompertz, whose name on native lips was assimilated to that of Ganpat, better known as Ganesh, the deity of good fortune. Ladakh, it may not be unnecessary to explain, 'was once the westernmost sub-kingdom of mysterious Tibet.' It is still Tibetan in its general features though annexed to Kashmir and included within the bounds of our Indian Empire. Major Gompertz is a lover of the wilds, and he gives here a vivid picture of the snow-clad roof of the world, where a wilderness of untrodden peaks pierces the sky, and where the trade route into Central Asia creeps up by gorges and glaciers to the summit of passes far higher than the highest Alps. But the writer's main interest is in the people, their ways, their thoughts, their religion. 'To me, for one, this attempt to understand men of other races, and of thoughts other than my own, is a pursuit that never palls and never fails to charm, however little success I may achieve in my endeavours.' His account of these things is most fascinating because so sympathetic. 'Life for the Ladakhi villager is a succession of days upon the road, alternated with days in his fields. He is of the earth, very earthy, much taken up with the matter of crops and animals, ignorant of books and movies, of wireless and politicians, of strikes and lock-outs, and the myriad other benefits conferred upon us by that Frankenstein monster, "progress." . . . The Ladakhi really believes in his gods and his demons, and more especially in the latter. And it always seems to me that in the first instance it is the matter of believing something which is of prime importance, rather than in what you believe. There are many people I have met who believe in nothing at all, except themselves, and I very much prefer the Ladakhi.' Major Gompertz has eyes to see, patience to investigate, a fine imagination, and a graphic pen, all of which combine to make his narrative almost as pictorial as the splendid illustrations which adorn his pages.

In spite of all that has been written and spoken about the League of Nations, it is doubtful if the man in the street could pass the simplest examination on its constitution, aims, and achievements. This ignorance can speedily be dispelled by a study of *Christianity and the League of Nations*, by the Rev. A. W. Harrison, D.D. (Sharp; 3s. 6d. net). It is a succinct, well-written account of the origin of the League, of its methods of work, its successes and failures, and of the difficulties to be overcome. The record is full of inspiration and of hope. The writer follows up the historical part with a discussion of the Christian view of international relations and a warm appeal for the support of the League in the interests of the Kingdom of God.

The Rev. J. K. Mozley, D.D., has a penchant for publishing little books, and here is another—*The Doctrine of God* (S.P.C.K.; 4s. net). It contains the substance of three lectures given at King's College, London, in 1925. But, although it is a little book, it should attract the attention of theologians; for it seeks to correct certain one-sided emphases in current doctrine. In the first lecture it is maintained that the ethical monotheism of Christianity confirms not only the highest level

of Old Testament religion, but what the best of the Greeks were trying to say; in the second lecture, that, if ethical monotheism represents an abiding stage in the doctrine of God, then some such relation of God to the universe as the cosmological and teleological arguments indicate must exist; and in the third lecture, that the idea of immanence implied in the New Testament derives its cogency from the belief that as God is the Creator and the Final Cause so also is He the Agent within the process, whereby its highest possibilities are made actual. As an example of correction of emphasis we cite the following: 'It is a striking fact that to this doctrine of immanence, so familiar, if not always profound, in modern religious thinking, unphilosophical Israel contributes far more than philosophical Greece.'

The Dean of Canterbury has written for publication a series of lectures which he gave to Cambridge students in the winter of 1926–27. They appear under the appropriate title of *The Modern Parson* (S.C.M.; 4s. net). The subject is 'Pastoral Theology,' but the title of the book accurately describes the way in which Dr. Bell has treated the matter. He deals first of all with the conditions facing the modern minister, conditions social, educational, and religious. And then he comes to the man who has to handle these conditions. One of the main points which he brings out in this sensible book is the variety of the opportunities which await a competent man. Dr. Bell thinks that one main reason for the dearth of candidates for the ministry is that this variety is not seen by the very men who could take advantage of the opportunities. Another prominent theme dealt with is the importance of the parson co-operating with other forces, religious and social, that are working for the good of parish or country. All these matters are handled in an adequate fashion. But the deeper things in a parson's life and equipment do not receive all the attention they deserve. We should have liked more than one chapter dealing with 'The Teacher and the Priest.' There are many good things said about preaching and about pastoral work, and we feel that Dr. Bell could have said much more if he had given himself space for the purpose. Still, we are thankful for what we get here, and the picture in these lectures of the modern conditions in which a minister must do his work, and of the many avenues of service open to him, is one that will, we hope, make its own appeal to the student mind. And on these lines the book will fill a place of its own.

'Therefore . . . because' (διὰ τοῦτο . . . ὅτι) and Parallel Uses.

By the Most Reverend John A. F. Gregg, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin.

The modern use of 'therefore' has moved away from what was a familiar use of the word in 1611. To-day 'therefore' means 'consequently,' and introduces an effect following on a previously stated cause. 'Therefore' was no doubt used in this consequential sense in the days of the translators of A.V. But it was employed also in another sense. As well as meaning 'for this reason' with a backward look, it could mean 'for this reason' with a (grammatically) forward look, as in Philem 15, 'Perhaps he therefore departed for a season, that thou shouldest receive him for ever.' Here 'therefore' does not represent consequence: 'therefore' = 'for this reason' anticipates the entire purposive clause 'that thou shouldest receive him again for ever' (διὰ τοῦτο ἐχωρίσθη, ἵνα . . . ἀπέχῃς).

But 'therefore' can also be an antecedent to 'because,' in which case 'therefore . . . because' means 'for the reason that.' We have a non-biblical example of this in Hooker, Sermon iii. (Keble, vol. iii. pt. ii. p. 793), 'Neither dare they *therefore* dispute against our actions, *because* our intentions are hidden,' *i.e.* 'The reason why they dare not dispute our actions is that our intentions are hidden.' 'Therefore' looks (grammatically) forward, not backward.

If this use of 'therefore' is borne in mind, various passages in the English Bible become easier to understand, especially in the Fourth Gospel.

'Therefore . . . because' corresponds to διὰ τοῦτο (ἐν τούτῳ) ὅτι, and we see the use in Ps 16[9, 10] 'Therefore my heart is glad . . . for' (because,

Ac 2^{27}) 'thou wilt not leave my soul in hell,' or in Ps 41^{11}, 'By this I know that thou favourest me, because ('that' P.B.V.) mine enemy doth not . . .' (ἐν τούτῳ ἔγνων, ὅτι οὐ μή). We might compare also Gn 11^{9}, διὰ τοῦτο ἐκλήθη τὸ ὄνομα σύγχυσις, ὅτι ἐκεῖ συνέχεεν κύριος, and 1 S 5^{5}, LXX, διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐπιβαίνουσιν οἱ ἱερεῖς, ὅτι ὑπερβαίνοντες ὑπερβαίνουσιν.

When we come to the Fourth Gospel, we find this anticipatory use of 'therefore' with 'because' (διὰ τοῦτο . . . ὅτι) occurring several times.

Jn 5^{16}. Therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, because he had . . .
5^{18}. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because . . .
8^{47}. Ye therefore hear them not, because ye are not of God.
10^{17}. Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life.
12^{18}. For this cause the people also met him, for that they heard . . .
12^{39}. Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said . . .
cf. 1 Jn 3^{1}. Therefore the world knoweth us not, because it knew him not.

In all these cases (as also in 1 Ti 4^{10}, 'therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust,' εἰς τοῦτο ὅτι), 'therefore' (διὰ τοῦτο) does not introduce a consequence following logically upon preceding words, or (according to some commentators) upon arguments expressed earlier in the book; it anticipates words which follow, τοῦτο being expanded into a substantival clause introduced by ὅτι. 'For this reason, viz. that . . .' The form of the sentence might be understood by comparison with Jn 8^{43}, 'Why do ye not understand my speech? Even because ye cannot hear my word' (διὰ τί τὴν λαλιὰν τὴν ἐμὴν οὐ γινώσκετε; ὅτι οὐ δύνασθε . . .), which might as readily have taken the form διὰ τοῦτο οὐ γινώσκετε, ὅτι οὐ δύνασθε; 'ye therefore do not understand . . . because ye cannot hear.' A parallel use of διὰ τοῦτο may be found in Mk 12^{24}, 'Do ye not therefore err, because ye know not . . .?' where διὰ τοῦτο is expanded into a participial clause, μὴ εἰδότες=ὅτι οὐκ ἴστε.

We find διὰ τοῦτο with the same forward (but purposive) look in 1 Ti 1^{16}, 'For this cause I obtained mercy, that in me first Jesus Christ might . . .,' and again in 2 Ti 2^{10}, 'Therefore I endure all things for the elect's sakes, that they may . . .'

In 1 Th 2^{13} διὰ τοῦτο . . . ὅτι is rendered 'For this cause also thank we God . . ., because,' but it is not easy to recognize that 'for this cause' looks not backward but forward, and is explained by the clause which follows, beginning with 'because.'

Even when 'therefore' is not the word used in A.V., and another expression, such as the one we have noticed in 1 Ti 1^{16}, 1 Th 2^{13}, 'for this cause,' is employed, the tendency for the modern reader is the same as when 'therefore' appears, viz. to throw the mind back to preceding words rather than forward to words which follow. It is not easy in Jn 18^{37}, 'For this end (εἰς τοῦτο) was I born, and for this cause (εἰς τοῦτο) came I into the world,' to remember that the 'end' and the 'cause' have yet to be stated, viz. that I should bear witness to the truth; or, again, in 1 Jn 3^{8}, 'For this purpose (εἰς τοῦτο) the Son of God was manifested,' to look forward to the statement of the 'purpose,' viz. that he might destroy the works of the devil.' The same trick of the mind operates in Eph 6^{22}, 'Whom I have sent unto you for the same purpose,' where εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο finds its explanation in the succeeding clause introduced by ἵνα, 'for this very object, viz. that ye may know.' Cf. also Col 4^{8}. Similarly in Ro 14^{9}, 'to this end' (εἰς τοῦτο) finds its explanation in the clause introduced by ἵνα, 'that he might be Lord both of the dead and living,' and in 2 Co 2^{9} 'to this end' (εἰς τοῦτο) anticipates the ἵνα clause 'that I might know the proof of you.' The absence of any backward reference is to be seen clearly in Tit 1^{5}, where the first words of the subject-matter of the Epistle, after the salutation are, 'For this cause' (τούτου χάριν), 'For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order.' In all these cases, the succeeding clause with ἵνα is merely an explanation of τοῦτο, on which it is clearly dependent.

Very similar is the use of ἐν τούτῳ . . . ὅτι ('herein,' 'hereby,' 'in this'). Jn 9^{30}, 'Herein is a marvellous thing, that he hath . . .,' and 1 Jn 4^{10} cause us difficulty; but in 1 Jn 3^{16} A.V. does not present the meaning of the Greek to the modern reader when it renders ἐν τούτῳ ἐγνώκαμεν τὴν ἀγάπην, ὅτι . . . ἔθηκεν as 'Hereby perceive we the love *of God*, because he laid down.' It should rather be, 'In this know we the love *of God* (viz.), that he laid down.' Again, the meaning of 1 Jn 4^{9} is that 'the love of God was manifested in (or through) this, viz. that God sent . . .' I cannot help thinking that in the two parallel sentences, each beginning with 'hereby' (ἐν τούτῳ), 1 Jn 3^{24}, 'Hereby we know that he abideth in us,' and 1 Jn 4^{13}, 'Hereby know we that we dwell in him,' the word 'hereby' is intended to throw the mind forward to an explanation, which in the first

sentence is 'by the Spirit which he hath given us,' and in the second is the clause introduced by ὅτι, where I should render the whole verse, 'In this know we that we abide in him, and he in us; in this, viz. that he hath given to us of his Spirit.' The use of ἐν τούτῳ ('hereby') followed by ἐάν in 1 Jn 2^3, or by ὅταν in 1 Jn 5^2, like that in Jn 15^8, where it is followed by ἵνα, seems little more than a variant for ἐν τούτῳ ὅτι, and hardly calls for comment.

There are four passages wherein ἐν τούτῳ or εἰς τοῦτο occurs, in which, I think, help is afforded by the usage we have been observing.

(*a*) 1 Jn 4^{17}. If ἐν τούτῳ is taken closely with ὅτι, we should have the following: 'In this hath love been made perfect with us (that we may have boldness in the day of judgment); in this, viz. that as he is, so are we in this world.' And the meaning would be, (v.[16]) God is love, and he who loves abides in God. Love is made perfect in us when our life in the world is as Christ's life was: His life was without fear of man, for perfect love expels fear. If we had true love for man we should have no fear of man. Fear of man produces torment, and the truly loving man, like Christ, knows not that torment. The fearing man has not touched love in its perfectness.

(*b*) 1 P 4^6, 'For, for this cause was the gospel preached also to them that are dead, that they might be judged' (εἰς τοῦτο εὐηγγελίσθη ἵνα κριθῶσι). 'For this cause,' like 'therefore,' looks not backward but forward. If we look backward, we seek for the 'cause' in vain. The reason why the gospel was preached to the dead is to be found in the succeeding words, 'The gospel was preached for this cause (or purpose), viz. that they may be judged in the flesh . . .'

(*c*) 1 P 3^9 (A.V.), 'Knowing that ye are thereunto called, that ye should inherit a blessing.' 'Thereunto' should be taken closely with 'that,' as in previous cases of εἰς τοῦτο followed by ἵνα, and then we render 'knowing that the purpose for which ye were called is that ye should inherit blessing.' R.V. translates, omitting 'knowing' (εἰδότες), and rendering 'for hereunto were ye called, that ye should inherit.' The sense is made clearer, but even so it is still possible to interpret with the sense inevitably suggested by A.V., with its backward-looking 'thereunto,' viz. 'Ye were called thereunto, *i.e.* to endurance of evil and railing, but instead of cursing ye are to bless. And ye know ye were called to this endurance, that out of it ye should inherit a blessing.' But what St. Peter says is that ye must, instead of returning evil and railing, return blessing (εὐλογία), because it was into this that ye were called, this, viz. the possession of blessing, which you receive as you give. And he quotes Ps 34, to show that blessing depends on a controlled tongue and pure lips.

(*d*) 1 P 2^{21} (A.V.), 'For even hereunto were ye called, because Christ also suffered for us.' As usual, 'hereunto' (εἰς τοῦτο) suggests the backward reference, and therewith the notion that what the writer states that Christians are called to is 'doing well and suffering for it.' But should not the mind rather travel forward from εἰς τοῦτο to the clause introduced by ὅτι? The argument seems to be that it is thankworthy (v.[19]) if a man endure grief, suffering wrongfully. Thankworthy also is it (v.[20]) if, when ye do well and suffer for it, ye take it patiently. Εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκλήθητε, ὅτι καὶ Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. 'For that into which ye were called was the truth that Christ suffered for you and left you His sinless example, neither reviling nor threatening.' There seems no reason why the writer should affirm that Christians are *called* into undeserved sufferings. Such sufferings will befall them incidentally, but not inevitably; they are not permanent and essential characteristics of the Christian life. But what is characteristic of their calling is that the Christ into whom they are called, suffered, leaving us an example, and suffered patiently, committing Himself to God, the righteous Judge. Slaves therefore should be submissive, even to froward masters, not because it is the badge of Christians to suffer, but because they are called into a Christ who suffered wrong with patience, leaving us an example that we should follow His steps.

Prophetic Vocation: A Comparison.

By the Reverend R. C. Gillie, M.A., D.C.L., Bath.

The three great prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, overtop all others by the volume of their recorded words. Quantity as well as quality of output is an element in our estimate of greatness. And these three mountain-peak men are as remarkable for the length of their prophetic activity as for their wide range of thought. Ezekiel's ministry lasted twenty-two years, Jeremiah's forty, and Isaiah's at least as long. They all began their ministry as young men.

This largeness of labour is manifest to the casual reader, but it is easy to miss another feature, common to all three, which distinguishes them from their fellow-prophets. Each began his ministry by an ecstatic experience of marked originality. There was a creative moment in the life of each which not only endowed them with the messages they were to deliver in season and out of season, but also achieved a transformation of personality. Without this inward transformation their ministry, however enlightened, would have lacked force. An explosive energy launched them on their prophetic career. All three lay strong emphasis on this fact.

This is the more noteworthy when we compare them with the other prophets of Israel and Judah, especially the author-prophets. Moses and Samuel began their prophetic careers by similar experiences of intimate and immediate contact with God, but of none of the others is any vocation-vision recorded. Elijah bursts suddenly from the uplands of Gilead upon recreant Israel. Elisha is called decisively, but by the hand of Elijah rather than of God. Amos can say, 'The Lord took me from the flock,' but records nothing at the beginning of his prophetic career beyond the commanding word, 'Go and prophesy to my people Israel.' Hosea suffered from a tragical breakdown in his home life which made it possible for him to enter into the wounded love of Israel's God, but other men were betrayed in the same fashion. For the rest, with the exclusion of Jonah, they break suddenly into some moving or terrific utterance without a hint of what prepared or empowered them for it. Micah, for instance, calls at once for a world-wide audience, 'Attend, all nations; listen, O earth, and all on earth'; Haggai is immediately a herald, 'A message from the Lord of hosts'; Habakkuk is as abrupt, 'Look, faithless creatures, gaze, and be aghast.' But they all leave us in ignorance whether their intense conviction sprang from a creative moment of vision, or from a course of deep meditation issuing in an irresistible conviction. Their experience was apparently slow crystallization; that of the three was explosive.

I.

Our interest is thus quickened when we realize the uniqueness of the fact that the three greatest prophets began their lengthy ministries with a remarkable vision as well as a decisive communication from God. All the more when we observe how contrasted the three initial experiences are in form. There is little relation between them. Suspicion of imitation, whether conscious or unconscious, is impossible. The sublimity of Isaiah's vision makes Jeremiah's fascinated interest in the boiling over of a great stew-pot almost ludicrous. The simplicity of Isaiah's vision, sublime as it was, differs violently from the elaboration of detail of Ezekiel's, which is none the less impressive.

Studying the three creative moments more closely, we penetrate to the most decisive contrast. The need of each of the three prophets is markedly different from that of the other two. All alike were crippled by a feeling of unfitness, but the sources of the unfitness in each case are not to be confounded.

Isaiah is bitterly conscious of personal and national sin, paralysing him. He has no temperamental fear of becoming a public character, or of the call to rebuke evil in men and nations.

Jeremiah, on the other hand, has no sense of acquiescence in evil. From childhood he had lived a life isolated from wrongdoers, dedicated to communion with his God. He is curiously destitute of any sense of personal taint. It is his temperament which causes him to tremble at the prospect of publicity. His is a shrinking nature. He is in a panic at the thought of boldly attacking the evils of his time, in which he has had no share.

Ezekiel differs from both Isaiah and Jeremiah. He was not crippled by condemnation of conscience or disability of temperament. His difficulty is of another kind. He has to break away from his environment and become an individual over against both God and his nation. He has 'to

stand upon his feet' before God's message can be delivered, to find himself and take resolute hold upon himself. Like Jeremiah, he is warned against cowardice—'Be not rebellious like this rebellious folk,' but the risk of cowardice was not because of his temperament but because of his situation.

If this analysis be correct, a double contrast confronts us. On the one hand, the big three are isolated from other spokesmen of God by a sudden and overwhelming experience at the beginning of their labours. On the other hand, they are isolated from each other by the difference of their need and of God's answer to their need. In these three individuals we see God dealing with the three great hindrances to Christian service—a sense of moral failure, a defect of temperament, an entanglement of personality.

II.

Isaiah was an aristocrat and familiar with the royal palace, a devout citizen and familiar with the Temple at Jerusalem. God's self-disclosure to him takes form and colour from his ordinary haunts.

The Most High is revealed as a monarch with a retinue of seraphim, the lightning-angels, distinguished from the cherubim, who may be described as the cloud-angels. Immediately the note of awe is struck. They have six wings, but only two are for flight; four are for reverence, hiding face and feet. Before the overwhelming Majesty they seek to efface themselves. Voices of adoration like thunder shake the doorposts, and proclaim God's holiness and universal rule. Smoke begins to fill the Temple palace, symbol of mystery. It is not incense smoke, symbol of prayer. What are the great impressions made by the vision? Two.

1. Earlier prophets had known that Jehovah's power was not confined to Israel. They had escaped from the thought of a localized God, but they had tended to delimit His frontiers. The conviction seizes Isaiah that there are no frontiers. God is governor of the whole world. Assyria is His rod, as Judah is His child. The Seraphim heighten the impression of supremacy. God works through agents, does nothing save through these flaming servitors of His. He Himself is 'high and lifted up.'

2. But though so high, He is not remote; though universal, there is neither defect nor oversight in His government. 'Holy, holy, holy'—these are the affrighting words. The terror which seizes the prophet has a moral origin. He feels that he is steeped in uncleanness, personal and national, and is powerless to cleanse himself or his people. This is the noblest contribution of the Jewish faith. The contrast felt is not, in the first place, between might and weakness, or between wisdom and folly, or between wealth and poverty, but between moral perfection and moral imperfection.

Why the emphasis upon 'unclean lips'? Because there is continual worship of Jehovah in Jerusalem, the elaborate ritual is maintained unceasingly. The prophet is dismayed at the effrontery of it as he beholds unveiled holiness and realizes the moral squalor of the worshippers. Their pollution seems to him to lie upon their lips.

It is equally remarkable that the cleansing achieved in Isaiah is neither by his own invitation, nor by his own act, and involves pain. The burning coal from off the altar, symbol of Divine holiness, alone can cleanse, and fire hurts. But the pain is unnoted and unmentioned in the joyful sense of release of personality. Cleansing brought with it an immediate sense of personal freedom and personal capacity. The authentic experience of Divine grace brought with it assurance of emancipation and equipment. As soon as the challenge to service sounds forth, even though it be by the voice of the Eternal Himself, 'Here am I, send me,' leaps to the lips of the cleansed man.

There is no explicit message of Divine forgiveness in Isaiah's experience. But the essential facts concerning forgiveness as concerning cleansing are here. Not by evasion of the Divine holiness, but by contact with it, is either pardon or purgation accomplished. Both are from God, neither self-induced nor self-created. And the process is marked by pain. 'Forgiveness is always a costly and tragical transaction.'

In Isaiah's experience, what may be called conversion and the unmistakable sense of vocation coincide. Sometimes vocation precedes conversion, oftenest vocation follows conversion; here they are simultaneous.

III.

There could scarcely be a greater contrast than that between Isaiah and Jeremiah, both in their circumstances and in their vocation experience.

Jeremiah was a country priest, much more familiar with rustic scenes than with the life of the city, though it was not far off. He was interested in the trees and changing seasons. He had often watched the cooking and washing operations at the

cottage doors, where they take place in a warm climate. He had apparently lived an isolated life, in the nation but not of it, chiefly acquainted with himself and with God. He had noted the growing alienation of his people from right ways and true religion, but it had not entered his mind that he had a responsibility in the matter. He was without ambition, and conscious of his own inadequacy.

There is an extraordinary naturalness in his epoch-making interview with God. There is nothing strange to him in the impression of God's intimate nearness. That had often happened before. The strangeness is in what is said to him. From childhood he had talked with God. Communion with the Unseen One had been his habit. That had helped to isolate him from others. Now, in a flash, he is made to know the meaning of it. He had not only been isolated, he had been set apart from birth for a purpose, and the purpose was nothing less than to be a 'prophet to the nations.' That disconcerted him, though the nearness of God did not. Inadequacy, not impurity, is his disability—'Ah but, O Lord Eternal, I cannot speak, I am too young.' Immaturity is his plea, but there is a deeper difficulty. He thinks really that he never will be old enough. God speaks to his unspoken fear: 'Be not afraid at the sight of them, for I am with you to succour you.'

The intimacy of the conversation is heightened by the Divine gesture which accompanies it. Jeremiah, like Isaiah, gains a sense of new endowment, just where he is most conscious of need, on his lips. But it is not a seraph, with a glowing coal in the altar-tongs, who touches his lips; not a servitor of the Most High, but the Most High Himself. 'And then the Lord put out his hand to touch my mouth; the Lord said to me, "There! I have put my words into your mouth: here and now I give you authority over nations and kingdoms, to tear up, to break down, to shatter, to pull down, to build up and to plant."' Was ever a wider and more authoritative commission given to a prophet? Was ever such a tremendous charge bestowed in simpler fashion? Was ever timidity at the moment of vocation counterbalanced by a more lavish promise of Heaven-sent enabling energy?

The truth is that this is probably the clearest foreshadowing of the Incarnation to be found in the Old Testament. God to Jeremiah in that hour was very like in word and act to what Jesus of Nazareth was to His disciples. All the sublimity of the momentous visions granted to Isaiah and Ezekiel at the opening of their careers is less than the singular intimacy of contact granted to Jeremiah. Let it be repeated that this great boon was bestowed to counteract a defect of temperament, his natural timidity.

The two accompanying visions of assurance are of the same stark simplicity. 'Homely' is the only adjective to apply to them. Amazing though it appears to us, the first is based upon what we can scarcely avoid calling a pun. Jeremiah sees the shoot of an almond tree, called the *wakeful* tree because of its early blossoming. He is told that God will be *wakeful* over His word to perform it. God on the alert! That is the message for a man of shrinking temperament.

The second vision of a cauldron, belching forth steam and boiling fluid southwards, represents both the devastation and the source of the destroying forces which are to overwhelm Judah. The bareness of the vision makes its message all the more grim.

Finally, the tremendous promise is given that this trembling spokesman will be made like a city with walls of bronze—adamantine, impregnable, inviolate. There is no sentence in the Scriptures more like metal. No inhibition springing from habitual self-depreciation can stand against this word of the Lord, 'I—I fortify you.'

This discovery of vocation has nothing to do with conversion. Jeremiah knew no conversion. It sprang from long-sustained communion with God, habitual from opening consciousness. But it was a discovery of the availableness of God to outweigh every inbred deficiency of a man's original being. It was new creation.

IV.

The vision of Ezekiel comes before the charge to labour and is entirely without any word of God or angel. It is a little incoherent, imperfectly harmonized, in places almost abnormal. The prophet saw more than he can tell. 'In the middle of the Creatures there was *Something* moving to and fro like glowing coals, like torches afire that gleamed and flashed out lightning.' 'Such was the appearance of what resembled the splendour of the Eternal.'

This vision is also distinguished from the others by a vivid sense of colour. 'The colour of amber,' 'the colour of a topaz,' 'blue like a sapphire,' 'a bright halo like the rainbow,' reveal the artist temperament. There is a curious interest in machinery too. The wheels with their special arrangement which baffles our understanding

form an extraordinary feature. Science and art combine here with religion. It is strangely modern.

The details, full of suggestion, are so numerous that it is easy to miss the forest by looking at the trees. What is the main impression made by the vision? That is the important thing.

It is an impression of Divine Energy, perfectly controlled but indescribably active. There is perfect symmetry, for the four creatures are four-sided, and the celestial chariot they support and convey is four-sided. There is also perfect rhythm of movement—'each moves straightforward,' 'whenever the creatures moved, the wheels moved with them.' Especially notable, the whole apparatus is penetrated with intelligence. At the risk of grotesqueness this is emphasized—the wheels 'were full of eyes all around,' 'a living spirit was in the wheels.'

No doubt the vision derived some of its features from the amazing accompaniments of a highly wrought civilization into which Ezekiel and his fellow-exiles had been suddenly transported. The buildings of Babylonia were adorned by strange paintings of creatures, half-man and half-beast, many of them with wings. The rumble and rattle of wheeled traffic were continually in his ears. But the format of the vision must not blind us to its substance. It was a revelation of Divine Energy continually at work, by its swiftness omnipresent, fully available at every point. The everywhereness of the Energy is emphasized, but the supreme fact is Itself, its manifoldness and inclusiveness and intelligence. Everything imaginable is called in—wings and wheels, the faces of man and bull and eagle and lion, the colours of the sky and of jewels, lightning and rainbow—to heighten the impressiveness of Power. Language cracks and almost collapses under the strain. Personality is just saved. 'On the thronelike appearance there was the semblance of a human form.'

No doubt the message implicit in this vision was partly for the compatriots of Ezekiel. It was addressed to their situation. They were inclined still to think of Jerusalem as the throne of God, for a Jewish king, though a vassal, still ruled there. They are reminded that the Energy of God can flash from Jerusalem to Babylon in a moment. They fed their courage by the hope that things would remain as they were, that Jerusalem would abide unconquered and undestroyed. Here was the message of a Vitality that could form the future as easily as it maintained the past.

But the chief impact of the message was for Ezekiel himself. He was one of a group of exiles in an alien land. Their circumstances tended to make them cling together, to lose their individuality in their sense of racial and national unity, to forbid any kind of criticism of the community, past or present. Under such circumstances it was easy to lose one's sense of private responsibility in a stupor of patriotism. That was Ezekiel's danger. His environment was drugging his manhood.

If, however, within and without this situation of his people and himself, there sped hither and thither the intense and intelligent Energy of God Himself, the situation was transformed. If he could in any degree receive this energy, he was immediately re-endowed with personality. Its intention was not to stun, but to stab him broad awake. Abject prostration before the splendour of the Eternal was not asked from him. The supreme demand was to accept his individual responsibility and act upon it. The first words which break from the overwhelming majesty are these, 'Son of man, *stand up*, and I will speak to you.'

Here is a demand for something which lies behind either conversion or vocation. A man must be himself and realize himself before he can either receive or serve, receive the highest gift or serve on the most sacred mission. It is impossible to take a grip of God before one has taken a grip of life, and man cannot take a grip of life before he has taken a grip of himself. The Master of mankind said of the prodigal son, 'he came to himself,' before 'he came to his father.'

V.

Hesitatingly I offer a few suggestions arising from this study.

1. With too facile tongue and pen it is asserted to-day that we preachers are as truly prophets for our generation as Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel were for theirs, that all inspiration differs not in kind but in degree, that we are as essentially equipped to be spokesmen of God as these ancients were. Is that true? Without them, and apart from them, have we a like experience of the immediacy of Divine communicativeness? Even with them to help us, with their announcements of God's character and power to guide us, have we any vision of God as concrete and as authoritative as theirs? Are we not wiser if we are more humble, recognizing that we serve the same God, with

larger knowledge and immensely enriched stores of revelation, but with less dramatic and less authoritative direct disclosures of the Divine will and mind? We have to think more. That is not our disgrace, if it does not prevent us believing more abundantly, more intensely. But to claim a like directness of communication, stamped with the unmistakable seal of Divine authority? That, I for one will not claim. Without the revelation of God in the Bible and in our Lord Jesus Christ I am undone, without a chart if not without a compass.

2. We are reminded of the manifoldness of the Divine activity. He takes His chief workers from every type of personality and from every type of experience. He still needs and finds the statesman-prophet and the artist-prophet, the messenger of hope and the messenger of doom, the recluse and the man of affairs, endowing them with the gifts which make them fit for apparently impossible tasks. We easily limit His range and doubt His availableness for our kind of requirement. He still controls the births of great personalities, He still invades every kind of life with His thunderous or whispered challenge.

3. We are reminded equally of the Divine resources. 'There is no kind of difficulty within us or without us with which He cannot deal.' Smear and stain of sin, defect and disability of temperament, entanglement and imprisonment of environment—the Divine Energy can liberate and endow and renew according to our and His need. All the modern elucidations of how things affect the soul of man are useful, if we remember the inestimable powers of recovery and revitalization which are in God alone. Forget that, and we are without hope. Recollect that, make it a part of our working faith, and we belong to the conquerors.

4. Finally, the greatest servants of God begin with a creative experience in their own life. It may not be conversion—we need a bigger name—but it is transformation. If that dies out of our message we defraud our fellows of the good news they need most tragically in this hour. Nay, we do a worse thing, we come near to baffling God when He seeks to redeem our time by personalities newly empowered because newly endowed with what only God can give. On His power to penetrate human personality and to transform it, we must insist if we are to continue to believe in the God revealed in the Old and the New Testaments.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

An Easter Sermon.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

'The hour cometh, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live.'—Jn 5^{25} (R.V.).

Easter is the time when all the face of Nature is preaching in white and gold and purple the message of Resurrection. For long months the world has been silent: the fields bare, the trees gaunt and leafless, the birds' voices unheard. It has seemed as if all the beauty of the world was buried and lost.

But although buried it was not dead. Nature was a Sleeping Beauty with a spell upon her. She lay helpless and silent until the sun, that Fairy Prince, stooped and kissed her and she woke to new life.

That is the wonder of Easter. It is as if the sun, that great light of the world, was saying what Jesus, who is 'the Light of the world,' said once —'the hour cometh, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live.' So the world hears a voice and lives. There is a green on the bare brown fields, a bursting of buds on the trees that shall clothe their nakedness in fair, new garments, and a great and glad singing of birds. This is God preaching from the book of Nature what He preaches in His other Book, the Bible—life from the dead—Resurrection.

I want to tell you how I once saw it.

It was in a garden. The front was just a bare, dull sweep of gravel; but in the midst of it, like a point of flame, was a crocus. There had been a flower-bed there, but to save work it had been dug up, its flowers taken away, the earth smoothed and beaten down and covered with gravel. It seemed the finish of the flower-bed, but deep down was one crocus bulb overlooked and left. Under cartloads of gravel that little vital streak of life lay sleeping. Then the Easter sun shone out and called to it—'Awake, thou that sleepest, and I will

give you light'—and sent its long fingers of wakening warmth down into the cold darkness and touched it. It wakened from its long sleep and pushed up persistently towards the light, through the hard and heavy soil, through the unkindly gravel, bravely and gallantly, until it burst out into the light and unfolded the glory of its golden robes.

It seemed impossible, but there it was, a miracle of resurrection. I thought it the bravest and most wonderful thing I had ever seen; and I can never forget the picture of that stony waste with the gallant little thing of gold shining out in its midst like a gospel.

It is a gospel.

Our hearts are often like that garden. The Gardener, who loves the hearts of girls and boys, plants them with seeds that are meant to flower with beauty and fragrance. 'Honesty' and 'Lad's Love' and 'Forget-me-not,' white flowers of Holiness and Truth, and flowers of Sacrifice, blue flowers of Faith with heaven's blue in their hearts—these He plants and looks to see them grow. God is the Gardener. He didn't stop planting gardens because once 'He planted a garden in Eden' and man spoiled it. He goes on planting gardens, and we go on spoiling them.

Evil things of this world come and persuade us to the ungracious task of digging them up. We sweep away the plants and stamp down the earth and strew it with stones and call it 'Progress.' But—

Down in the human heart, crushed by the tempter,
Feelings lie buried that grace can restore.

The grace of Christ, the Light of the World, shines upon us to waken the dead in us, the Sleeping Beauty of our soul, the forgotten things, the graces that are waiting to be born.

It may be a verse of a hymn that stirs them, the quietness of Holy Communion, the tenderness of a christening and the white innocence of a little child, or, perhaps, some sore sorrow. But it is all the grace of Christ, who uses many ways to waken our sleeping souls to life.

Will you hear Him? You haven't really begun to live till you do. Is Easter to be only the truth of a far-off garden long ago in old Jerusalem, and of the world of Nature around us? Or is it to be the truth of your young heart—now?

It may be. It is meant to be. When we sing 'Hallelujah! Christ is risen,' it should not be just a glad remembrance, but something we know in ourselves. We ought to be able to go on and sing, with the same gladness, 'We are risen.'

There is no grave of selfishness, or forgetfulness, or feebleness, or old hard-trodden-in habit, no strong weight of disappointment or sorrow, that has power to hold our soul, if we will hear Christ, any more than the earth and the gravel had power to keep down the crocus, so frail and feeble. That answered the call of the sun: so can we.

The ever new message of Easter-tide, the wonderful gospel of the Resurrection, is, 'The hour cometh, and now is, when the dead shall hear Thy voice; and they that hear shall live.'

Girls and boys, 'now' means 'now'; and 'they' means 'you.'

Two Men's Treasure.

By the Reverend William J. May, Ilkeston.

'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth . . .; but lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven.'—Mt $6^{19.\ 20}$.

The newspapers are full of all sorts of things, beautiful things as well as nasty things; only sometimes they print the nasty things so large and the lovely things so small that the lovely things are overlooked and not read.

Not very long ago the newspapers told us that two men had died and both had begun life as poor boys, both had left very much treasure behind them, only different kinds of treasure. The papers told the story of one man who had been poor and had worked hard and looked ahead and saved money, and at his death he had left behind him about £4,000,000. I do not know how much money that is, but it is a great deal for one man to have to worry about. Then the papers went on to say that in his will the rich man said he had not left any money to help hospitals and poor people, because he had given away a lot of money while he had been alive. The papers said that he had given £10,000 to a hospital here, and £10,000 to a hospital there, and that was all.

Then the papers told a much finer story. Another man had died—a young man, this one. Between thirty and forty years ago a little boy was ill in a hospital ward in Liverpool. He was very poor. He was very ill. At first he was very, very miserable. He thought that he was going to die, and that no one cared whether he did die or live. But soon he began to think differently. He had a comfortable bed and clean clothes. That was rather nice. He thought he would like to live a bit longer to enjoy the nice bed and the clean clothes. Most wonderful of all, people were kind to him. Nobody kicked him because he was in

the way. Nobody cursed him because he needed something. People did things for him as though they liked doing them, did them as though they thought he was worth it; and the boy thought he would like to live just to have a little more kindness shown him. He soon began to get well, and the kindness kept on. It got right down inside his heart, and he said to himself:

'When I grow up, if ever I get a chance, I will do something for the hospitals, just to tell them that I am grateful for their kindness.'

The boy got well and grew up and became the editor of a great London newspaper. He knew that he was not likely to live very long, but he made up his mind that he would *live* every hour he was here, and, especially, that he would do all he could for boys and girls who were just as miserable and unhappy as he had been, and for hospitals.

One day he stood in a long hospital ward in a London hospital where every bed had some one in it whose eyes were bad. The sunlight was pouring in through the windows but they could not see it. There were lovely flowers on the tables and by the bedsides and no one to see them but the nurses. The patients were in the dark hour after hour, day after day, night after night. There was nothing they could do to pass the time, nothing to help them to forget the pain, nothing to cheer them up when they were afraid they would never see the sunshine and the flowers again.

'I wish I could do something to help them,' he said. 'There are so many of them, so many hospitals full of sick folk, full of people waiting for operations, people in terrible pain, people tired of lying in bed. I wish I could do something'—then it came to him all in a flash—'Wireless! Let them listen in.'

But that meant a lot of thinking and planning. How were you going to have a set with three hundred pairs of headphones? Who would look after it and tune it in? And, above all, who would pay for it? So he talked to wireless engineers and hospital governors and doctors and all sorts of people. Then he talked to everybody through his newspaper:

'How would you like to be in hospital all day in the dark in pain with nothing to do? Wouldn't you like to help me put in wireless for these sick people?'

The King said, 'Yes, please,' and the Queen said, 'Of course, we should,' and lots of ordinary, common people said, 'Rather!' and they sent shillings and half-crowns and five-pound notes and headphones, and to-day, at every bed in every hospital in London, there is a pair of 'phones that sick people may listen in or else a loud speaker in the ward.

And all over the country people said, 'We, too, have a hospital. Our sick people shall have wireless,' and they did it. It was all because people were kind to a little sick, miserable boy and he grew up and fulfilled his vows.

Even then he was not content. He remembered that there are schools here and there where there are boys and girls who have got into trouble with the police and have been sent to these schools to learn to behave themselves. They ought to have wireless, too, he said. Once more he talked to the people through his paper, and the wireless came.

Then, only a few weeks before he died, he remembered the men who keep the lights burning on the lighthouses and light-ships round the coast and warn vessels to keep away from the rocks, and sometimes do not see a newspaper for five or six weeks at a time.

'They also deserve to have wireless,' he said, and once more he talked to people through his newspaper, and the wireless came.

Well, he had not got much money in his pocket when he died, but I think he had great treasure, and the treasure of all the love and kindness he showed and all he did for other people is something which he has not left behind, but something which is his very own for all eternity. Do you remember what Jesus once said?

'Lay not up for yourselves treasures on earth . . . but lay up treasure in heaven.' The stories from the newspaper help you to understand what He meant.

The Christian Year.

Easter Sunday.

The Tenderness of Christ towards those who have failed Him.

'Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you. And when he had so said, he shewed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord.'—Jn $20^{19.\ 20}$.

We cannot read our New Testament, where it describes the days which followed immediately upon the Crucifixion of our Lord, without feeling that that Awful Event had plunged the disciples for the time being into amazement and despair. It was not what they had expected. And although

Jesus had been careful to warn them against all worldly anticipations, it is quite evident to us that the disciples had never abandoned the hope that one day, it might be even at the very last moment, their Master would summon some supernatural force to His side and mount an earthly throne. We know what did happen. Jesus was crucified, dead, and buried.

There they were, then, full of disappointment concerning Christ, things not having turned out as they had expected, the whole world for the time being seeming to them to be awry and senseless. Along with that they had the feeling, though they may not have understood themselves at the first, that, talk as they might in their anger about going back to their old habits, as a matter of fact they could never be the same as they had been—that now, since they had been going about with Christ for three years dealing with matters which, it might be, were beyond them, yet not quite beyond them and not always beyond them, they could never now go back to those occupations with which at one time they had been content. When a man has once seen Christ, he may one day abandon Christ, but he can never be quite the same. Mingling with these two feelings there was that other—that the death of Jesus had tried them in the balance and had found them wanting. The Crucifixion had made it quite clear to everybody who cared to think about them, that the disciples at that stage were merely worldly men. Now we are never so angry as when we are angry at ourselves. We are never so disappointed as when we are disappointed in ourselves.

1. In the first place, then, it was to men who were honestly disappointed in Christ, disappointed that He had permitted Himself to die, that Jesus appeared showing them His wounds. Seeing Him there, and thus, a great blindness passed away from those disciples, a great worldliness and stupidity of the spirit was scattered like clouds by wind and sun. That came to pass in their minds which had just happened in the case of the two on the way to Emmaus—they saw, by a flash of insight into their own Scriptures and into their own history, that it behoved the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into His glory. They were Jews, and, seeing Jesus there with His pierced hands and side, they saw not the contradiction of the ancient faith, but the awful fulfilment of it. Christ in disappointing their poor worldly thoughts about Him, and poor worldly ambitions for Him, had not disappointed them on the High and Holy Plane, on that only plane whereon the soul can be satisfied—when we see God stooping in Holy Love and Suffering to save.

2. Resolving that darkness, Jesus dealt also with a second source of darkness in their spirits. Much of the sorrow of the disciples in the days immediately after Calvary came to them as they looked forward to the days that lay before them. How were they to go on without that society, that companionship, about which they were only now beginning to understand what it had been to them? But, appearing now as He did, that great sorrow in their hearts was composed. It was as though He, Christ, were saying to them: 'I am still with you. All that I ever was to you I am still, and may be to you more and more. I was dead: I am alive for evermore. Death is nothing to such a communion as we may have.' And so, once more 'were the disciples glad when they saw the Lord.'

3. Much of the sorrow of the disciples arose from their miserable thoughts about themselves. They had seen Christ taken captive, and they had forsaken Him. One of them had seen Him buffeted in the Judgment Hall and had denied Him. They had seen Him crucified and made a public spectacle, while they had stood afar off beholding these things. The Cross had found them out. Christ's three years' patience with them had gone for nothing.

'And Jesus came and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you, and he shewed unto them his hands and his side.' And how did it comfort them, how did it make them glad, to see His wounds? Would it not add to their shame to see His hands and His side? Would it not have been a great kindness if Jesus had veiled His wounds, thus sparing them this goad to their own painful memories? No, for it was the wounds of Jesus which they most wanted to see. For away at the back of all their miserable thoughts about themselves there was this thought—that Jesus would never have any need of their love now; that they had failed Him in the only days in which they might have been faithful to Him; that now He was away in a region where He had no need of their loyalty, either in the dim abode of shades, or in the radiant Presence of His Father.

'But Jesus appeared and shewed unto them his wounds. Then were they glad.' He was not yet, then, away beyond their reach, beyond a certain need of them. He had still—His wounds. There was something they could yet do: they could live in the world as those who have seen the unhealed wounds of the Saviour of the World.

We too have failed towards Christ in many a shameful way. And at times our bitterness is this,

that we think that we shall never be able to reinstate ourselves in Christ's affection. To us, too, to us at this sacred season, if our hearts are really engaged, Jesus comes, and He shows us His hands and His side. He shows us His wounds that are still open—shows us that there is still many a thing which we can do for His blessed sake, and in the doing may lose the bitterness of our memories.[1]

First Sunday after Easter.

The Winter is Past.

'Lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone; the flowers appear on the earth; the time of the singing of birds is come.'—Ca $2^{11.\ 12}$.

At this delightful season of the year, when we witness again the recurring miracle of the unfolding leaves and the new-blown flowers and the returning song-birds, there are few of us, I think, whose hearts do not leap forth to acclaim the wonder and glory of this radiant world. 'I love the smile of the earth,' cries a character in one of Mr. E. F. Benson's books—'I love the smile of the earth when she wakes in spring, and puts forth her thoughts again. When she thinks about hawthorn, she thinks in little squibs of green leaf; when she thinks about birds, she thinks in terms of nightingale-song; or when she thinks about crocuses, she sees her thoughts expressed in yellow chalices, with pollen-coated tongues. She thinks she has had enough of the grey winter-withered grass, and lo! the phalanxes of minute green spears charge and rout it. She thinks in the scent of wall-flowers, and the swift running of lizards on the stone walls, and pink of peach-blossom, and foam of orchid-flower. My goodness, what a poet she is!'

Now what is the special message of this blessed spring-season to us?

Well, in the first place, the spring is *the great natural revelation of life*—of revival, of rejuvenescence. It is the very season of resurrection. Graves open; sleeping things awake; imprisoned things are emancipated; dead things live. There is movement and change and progress. Everything is full of force, full of vitality, full of life, and is thrusting upwards and outwards towards yet more abundant life.

Every clod feels a stir of might,
An instinct within it that reaches and towers,
And groping blindly above it for light,
Climbs to a soul in grass and flowers.

[1] J. A. Hutton, *There They Crucified Him*, 246.

Now all this awakening into life that is going on around us—what is it but an acted parable of another sort of awakening into another sort of life and a higher? Is it not appropriate that we should keep Easter in the springtime, when all Nature is reviving from its death-like slumber? Is it not well that we should be reminded that the same Life-giving Spirit that is seeking out the dead things in the woods and fields, and transforming them so wonderfully into buds and leaves and tinted blossoms, is performing a similar gracious office for the benefit of man? He seeks the spiritually dead. He seeks the men who are dead 'in trespasses and sins'—the arrant outcasts and incorrigibles who have long been given up as hopeless, dead to home and dead to friends and dead to all decent society—dead to everybody but God. And He also seeks those other dead, who lie comfortably coffined in narrow formalities and respectabilities, buried in dismal sepulchres of spiritual lethargy and self-complacency, where no ray of light can touch them. To all these comes the Life-Giver.

To-day spring seems to be coming in a special sense. Everywhere around us dead things—cold, stiff, sapless, wintry things—seem to be stirring and warming and reviving. Dead peoples, dead societies—are they not gradually awakening to the larger possibilities of national existence? Dead churches, where a complicated system of ecclesiastical machinery has obscured or blocked out the vision of God—are they not being quickened to new insight and new vigour? Dead doctrines and beliefs, dead loyalties and allegiances—all sorts of beautiful things which, during long years of stagnancy, have drooped and shrivelled up and withered—all these have been touched by the breath of the Giver of Life, and begin again to flower and flourish. For the springtime—may we not believe it?—the springtime with its transfiguring freshness and vitality is coming back to us to-day, and 'once more,' as Tennyson puts it in his poem on 'Early Spring'—'once more the Heavenly Power makes all things new.'

Then, again, just as spring is a revelation of life, so is it, further, *a revelation of beauty*. Only think of the incomparable loveliness of the spring flowers alone. Why, so enchanting are those spring flowers that almost every one of them has found a poet of its own to sing its individual praises. The daisy, for instance, and the celandine have each been hymned by Wordsworth, the daisy once more by Burns, the snowdrop and the tulip by James Montgomery, the violet by Herrick, the primrose

by Henry Kirke White, the daffodil by Austin Dobson. Lowell, again, has celebrated the flame-like glories of the dandelion, Elizabeth Barrett Browning the 'mountain gorses, ever golden,' while Walt Whitman's magnificent chant, known as 'Lincoln's Burial Hymn,' is all fragrant with the clean, invigorating perfume of the lilac :

Stands the lilac bush, tall growing, with heart-shaped leaves of rich green,
With many a pointed blossom, rising delicate, with the perfume strong I love,
With every leaf a miracle.

And surely this exuberance of floral beauty is not without a meaning for the understanding heart. Is it not itself an exposition, as it were, a clear and conclusive demonstration, of the liberal love of God? That is exactly what it is. All this overflowing loveliness is a revelation of the bountifulness of the Providence that blesses us.

Then, lastly, not only is spring a revelation of life and a revelation of beauty; it is also *a revelation of abounding hope and joy*. No season of the year is so symbolic of pure joyousness. The whole world seems, as it were, to be breaking into laughter; and the echo of that laughter haunts the spring-songs of the poets. Listen!

In our hearts fair hope lay smiling,
Sweet as air, and all beguiling;
And there hung a mist of bluebells on the slope and down the dell;
And we talked of joy and splendour
That the years unborn would render,
And the blackbirds helped us with the story, for they knew it well.

We have been through our winter, our drab, depressing winter, and often we thought in despair that the spring would never come. Professional pessimists told us that it would never come. Yet, spring has indeed its 'certain date,' however it seem to be delayed. It is coming. It is certainly coming, though we cannot tell how it is coming. We really do not know how all things will work together ultimately for our good. We really cannot imagine how some of our losses will ever be made up to us. We cannot possibly divine how our sighs will be turned into songs, or how we shall win strength and salvation from our agony. It is all just a hope, and, in some of our moods, it seems to us a wildly extravagant hope. Yet the Divine way with Nature is the Divine way with the life of man. Out of winter comes the spring; out of misery nobly borne comes the rapture of great gladness. And for those who trust in the Lord and wait patiently for Him, the tardy hours will bring at length a priceless boon out of every sad experience, a thrill of delight out of every throb of pain, a solid advantage out of every apparent disaster, and in the end—some day, somewhere—the sweet music of the spring-song, 'Lo, the winter is past, the rain is over and gone; the flowers appear on the earth; the time of the singing of birds is come.'

This natural spring that we see everywhere about us, with its revelation of life, its revelation of beauty, and its revelation of joy—does it not bring to us this message?—'There shall be a new heaven and a new earth. There shall be a greener world and a bluer sky. There shall be a nobler manhood. There shall be new hearts and new souls. The old things are passing away amid fierce agitations and convulsions, and all things are becoming new.' Yes, a happier world is yet to be, where 'everlasting spring abides and never-fading flowers,' and where, as in long-lost Paradise, God Himself shall once more walk with man amid the bowers and blooms of the garden in the cool of the day. Let us look forward, therefore, with confidence to the better things that are in store for us. Let us anticipate, and prepare ourselves for, 'the earth's divine renewal.'[1]

Second Sunday after Easter.

In Another Form.

'After that he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country.'—Mk 16^{12}.

He appeared unto them in another form—not another person. It was the same Christ and Lord. But there was some difference of manifestation. That is the plain truth coming to meet us out of the region of mystery where for us the final truth of things must ever dwell. After His resurrection Jesus was to His disciples Jesus—with a difference. The disciples never doubted that He was the same Jesus with whom they had passed through the cornfields, and traversed the Syrian highways, and voyaged on Gennesaret. But the human form which was soon to pass from their midst already seemed to be playing a lessening part in their recognition of their Lord. In a little while they should see Him no more—that is, as a man sees his fellow-man. Soon the vision of the living and ever-present Christ was to be reserved wholly for the inward eye of every reverent and faithful soul. But it would

[1] F. H. Dudden, *The Delayed Victory*, 73.

appear that already the old order was changing, and the outward form of the Master was already becoming less and less an essential medium for the revelation and recognition of His unchanging personality. This much may be gathered from the story of the days between the Resurrection and the Ascension.

The Magdalene, to whom Jesus appeared in Joseph's garden, in the clear sunlight of the Easter morning, failed to recognize Him until He called her by her name, and that one word so tenderly spoken brought the flash of inward vision that told her she stood in the presence of her Lord. It was her heart that first recognized Him. Recall for a moment another scene. Peter and the two sons of Zebedee, with Thomas and Nathanael of Cana and two other disciples—seven of them in all—were coming ashore after a night of fruitless toil on the waters of Tiberias. Jesus stood on the beach and asked them how they had fared, and gave them instructions to cast their net again; and not one of the seven recognized Him until, as they hauled in the net and felt its straining meshes, and caught the silvery glimmer of scales beneath the water, one of them suddenly realized who it was at whose bidding they had cast their net. And it is very significant that the man who first woke to the recollection of this, and to the recognition of that Figure on the shore, was John, the disciple who was bound most closely to the Master by the bonds of affection, and who had that faculty of intuition and perception that is the birthright of affectionate and sympathetic natures.

Without following the history any further, it is clear that the story of the days between the Resurrection and Ascension tells us that, in the recognition of Jesus by those to whom He revealed Himself, the spiritual senses predominated over the physical, and the heart played an ever larger part in the work of perception. It is abundantly clear from the narrative that it was no apparitional and illusionary Christ that the disciples recognized; but it is equally clear that they who had been wont to recognize their Lord in precisely the same way as they recognized one another, now needed that their physical senses should be quickened and reinforced by the spiritual forces of memory, faith, and love.

And now, of all the things that might be learned from these strange and wondrous days when Jesus passed among His disciples—a figure so simply human, and yet so mysteriously Divine, now obeying and now conquering the laws of time and space—let us then learn this lesson: we must not think to find in the forms and manifestations of spiritual life that reality and finality which can only rightly be attributed to spiritual life itself. Form plays so large a part in our physical and material reckonings, judgment by appearance is so necessarily a part of our life in a world of appearances.

'He appeared in another form.' He is always doing that. Would that our faith were deep enough, would that our insight were keen enough, would that our love were catholic enough, to recognize Him in all the forms and fashions of His coming unto the children of men! For all of us whose religious experience is a reality there is one form we recognize. We know Him as He has come to us. Let us not think that every man must know Him exactly as we do. Let us never hold up before our brother's eyes our portrait of Christ, and say, 'That is He, and there is no other: when you see that you will see Him, and not till then.' Let us say to ourselves rather, 'That is my vision; but it may not be his.' Many a stumbling-block would be removed from the path of the seekers after Christ—and many a misjudgment would be averted or corrected—if only we could come to see that the Christ of all true spiritual experience has more than one fashion of revealing Himself to men, and of imparting to them the treasures of His grace. He has Divine power, Divine mercy, Divine love for us all. The Cross of His mysterious passion casts its healing shadow across the life of humanity. Some find the Risen Christ as the Magdalene who found Him suddenly when He named her name. Some find Him in the doing of His will, as the disciples who cast the net in Tiberias, and found it was their Master and Lord they were obeying. Some go the journey to Emmaus—the way of many a heart-burning, many a meditation, many a mind and spirit struggle—and find Him in the breaking of bread. At the core of all Christian experience there lies the same eternal truth, for it is the same Christ who meets us all; but many are the forms that experience can take.

'He appeared in another form.' These are words to hush for ever the foolish strife about modes of worship. There are those who look upon the eastern window of a cathedral, casting its glorious colours on altar-cloth and surplice and pavement, and say it stands for gross materialism. In their eyes the ritualist is an idolater. There are others who attend a meeting in a Salvation Army barracks, and go away and talk about irreverence. And they are all wrong. One man's history and tempera-

ment make symbolism and ritual invaluable to him; another man's history and temperament make him glory in a form of worship that is stripped of everything that might be called in any way symbolic. The same Christ appears to each worshipper. There is no change of personality, there is only a change of form.

And may we not find in these words we are considering a warning against associating the Divine revelation of God in Christ too exclusively with the thought and activity of the Christian Church? It has been already demonstrated to the satisfaction of most thoughtful people that there is no quarrel between Christianity and science. But it would seem in these later years that the scientists are themselves coming nearer and ever nearer to the Christian view of God and the world through that reverence, faith, and truth that are of the very essence of the truly scientific spirit. Many who have no regard whatever for orthodoxy have a supreme regard for truth, and are finding the truth along lines that are certainly not obviously evangelical.

'He appeared in another form.' There has come over the Christian Church a great change of view on more than one important part of the Christian creed. Our view of salvation is not so individualistic and self-regarding as it was. The oneness of the race, the socialism of the gospel, and the supreme self-forgetfulness of the Cross have taken men out of themselves, and wakened all the truly social and serviceable instincts of men's souls. Men are learning, as never before, to live for men. The words 'the people' are not a vague term, having no significance for the individual. The problem of the many is coming home to individual hearts and consciences. The man whose bread is sure is concerned about his brethren who are hungry. The woman whose life is set amid the sweet protections of a love-lit home is taking to her heart the pain and peril of her sister who is compelled to live her life face to face with the shames of the world. Some are afraid of this tendency and teaching. There is no need to be. It is the same Christ revealing Himself to men in another, and maybe a truer, form.

So, as we ponder the mysterious manifestations of the Risen Christ, let us remind ourselves that this same Jesus is ever in our midst, and we must be ready to recognize Him in the garden of our hope and sorrow, on the Tiberias of our daily toil, in the beauty of the earth, and in every place where duty, pain, or love may take us.[1]

[1] P. C. Ainsworth, *A Thornless World*, 93.

Third Sunday after Easter.

Christ Fashioned Within.

'It pleased God . . . to reveal his Son in me.'—Gal $1^{15.\ 16}$.

'My little children, of whom I travail in birth again until Christ be formed in you!'—Gal 4^{19}.

'Christ in you, the hope of glory.'—Col 1^{27}.

We are all familiar with the saying that in every man there are three personalities. But a truer reading of human nature modifies this statement. There is only one personality, but that personality lives and moves in three worlds of thought, desire, and will. The first of these three worlds is that of our ordinary thought and our transient feeling as they are expressed in the intercourse of life. The second is the world of inner desire, with its self-communing and unconfessed hopes and fears. But within and behind these two there is a third realm. It is a world wholly unknown to our fellowmen, and greatly dark to ourselves. It is the Holy of Holies—the shrine of the soul. The other two are only the Outer Court and the Holy Place.

We know how real this inmost and benmost sphere of life is. When we were children there were names which were household words, places familiar in every feature, incidents which were the great events of our short history, persons who were our guides. Many of these have melted into the infinite azure of the past. We cannot recall them by any act of will. Yet let some name stand out on a page, or let some word fall upon our ear from a speaker's lips, or let some old faded letter come into our hands, and at once, swimming up out of this secret inmost world, there come the names, faces, events, personalities, upon which we thought death had laid its binding spell. They were not dead; they were only lodging in this inmost and benmost world of our being.

The broad law of a victorious Christian life is that Christ must be dominant within the soul. Christ must be fashioned within. It is not enough that Christ should control the outer court of our life, our judgment, our habits, our intercourse with the world, or even our worship and services. It is not enough that Christ should be the Master in the second chamber of our being, and that we should think on Him with reverence, and dwell upon Him in quiet meditation, and find our minds glow with tender feeling towards His moral loveliness. Christ must pass in through the two outer courts. He must enter to abide within us, and to hold our will in the hollow of His hand. He must be the indwelling personality who will fashion us

like unto Himself. The whole history of the Christian conquest is the fashioning of Christ within.

There are three clearly outlined stages in this fashioning. The first is—*Christ born within;* the second—*Christ formed within;* the third—*Christ perfected within.*

1. *Christ born within.*—There is a decisive spiritual change by which a man becomes a Christian. We should not encourage any narrow thoughts about the circumstances of its happening, or the emotions which it arouses, or the words in which it finds expression. We are all so different in age and situation, in our past and even our present, in our training and our temperament, that no two men ever have had the same experience in this vital change. For that reason it is described in Scripture under many names. It is called: 'being renewed in the spirit of your mind'; 'being quickened together with Christ'; 'being called out of darkness into his marvellous light'; 'becoming a little child'; 'awaking as from a deep sleep'; 'passing from death unto life'; 'becoming a new creature in Christ Jesus.' But Jesus always uses the final, the perfect, and the most beautiful word, and He names it—the new birth. Where does this new birth take place? Not in the outer world of daily thought and action, and not in the inner world of self-communing. It takes place in this inmost core of our being. What is it in simplest terms? It is Christ passing into the secret place of our soul, a spiritual presence, to be fashioned within.

To that experience Paul refers in one of his strange words: 'It pleased God to reveal his Son in me.' We know how Jesus laid siege to Paul. We can mark the steps by which He conquered him. Paul's large, sane, penetrating mind began to understand the wisdom of Christ's words. Jesus, in His grace and loveliness, began to creep into the study of his imagination. Then Christ passed into the second world of Paul's deeper thought and more wistful desire. The conviction that the way of his walking was not securely right brought forth self-reproaches and strange relentings. The record of that stage of experience is to be found in the words, 'It is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.' But Christ was not yet born within. There came that moment on the road to Damascus when the great light shined about him, and the voice of Christ rang through him, and the barrier of the shrine was broken down, and Christ passed in to dwell at the centre of his being. God had revealed His Son in Paul.

2. *Christ formed within.*—It may seem that we are speaking in too high, too daring, and too mystic, a way when we declare that Christ may be fashioned within the spirit of man. But it should not be a strange thing to any one to say that one personality may possess and pervade another. It is quite within the range of our experience that one personality has become the life and force of another, so as to be formed within. Browning, with his usual insight into the working of the soul, has set this truth in his poem 'By the Fire-side.' He describes a simple scene. He shows us a husband and wife sitting by the hearthstone in the evening hour. They have lived in a close and unsullied fellowship. They are both growing old. The husband tells his wife how deeply and potently her personality and character have penetrated his. Then he passes to the scene of the perfect consummation. It came, as they stood at the close of day, on a rustic bridge over a quiet stream:

> A moment after, and hands unseen
> Were hanging the night around us fast;
> But we knew that a bar was broken between
> Life and life: we were mixed at last
> In spite of the mortal screen.

3. *Christ perfected within.*—'That God would make known what is the riches of the glory of this mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory.' This hope, made confident by the experience of its power, breathes through the aspirations of all the New Testament saints. Paul's prayer is consummated in John's unforgettable anthem, 'Beloved, now are we the sons of God; and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but when he shall appear we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.' What is the reality to which this hope looks out? The day is coming when all that is earthly shall pass away, and all that is temporal shall be no more. What shall remain is this inmost world of our personality where Christ has been formed within. There shall Christ be perfected. We have been planting our bulbs in the earth in the knowledge that:

> There is a day in spring
> When under all the earth the secret germs
> Begin to stir and grow before they bud.

As the life within begins to move, the outer husks and coverings fall away into death and rottenness. But the life sends up its living green shoots into the world of light and beauty. Then the form of the plant begins to appear, and finally the flower lifts its head in the mellow sunshine. So Christ,

born within and formed within, shall, in that new atmosphere of light and love, be perfected, and we shall be 'conformed unto the likeness of God's dear Son.'

All this rises up to a solemn issue. It brings us face to face with the alternative which cannot be escaped. Either Christ has been born within, and is passing on to a perfect fashioning, or some other personality is becoming the indwelling and dominant spirit of our inmost being. 'Behold, I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with me.' That is the timeless word of the wondrous music with which Christ seeks entrance that He may be fashioned within. But the shrine will not remain empty. If Christ be denied, some other will enter in. The Evil One will become dominant, and we shall be fashioned unto his likeness, as too many men have been.[1]

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Conquest of Limitation.

'Now I would have you know, brethren, that the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the progress of the gospel.'—Ph 1^{12} (R.V.).

Wherever there was a church in need Paul was there to help it; wherever there was an open door Paul was the first to step in. Nothing mattered to him except that the work should go forward, and the greatest part of its burdens he carried on his own shoulders. And now there are to be no more adventures. That part of the story is ended. The days of open doors have gone; all the doors now are barred and bolted. He is a prisoner. The need of distant provinces may cry out for help, but he cannot go in answer. New fields may open up, but he cannot take advantage of the occasion. The old adventurous spirit is in bonds. How will he regard it?

'Now I would have you know, brethren, that the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the progress of the gospel.' Resignation bows its head and says, 'What must be must be, I accept'; faith lifts up its eyes and says, 'Even here there is beauty and meaning and scope.' Now that is what we get in St. Paul's sentence. It is a verdict of faith. There is no submission about it. There is rather the note of a half-humorous conquest. The Apostle looks at his narrow confinement and says, 'Even this is not without its effect.' His prison turns into a new kind of pulpit. The work goes on.

[1] W. M. Clow, *The Evangel of the Strait Gate*, 151.

Now we are on the threshold of a great subject here. What is the task of faith in this world? Not so much to explain as to overcome! Faith does not set out to give us a clear-cut explanation of the why and wherefore of things; it is the spirit which goes out into the midst of inexplicable things to shape them after its own fashion. Faith is a life, not a scheme. Ultimately in this great business of human life mystery broods over the face of things, explanations are withheld, and the whole issue comes to this, whether we are going to wrest out of life's problems some gain which can never be lost. The man of faith does not know more about the meaning of life's problems than any of his fellows, he is not in possession of the key to the puzzle, but he has within himself the spirit which challenges life to give up its hidden riches.

So the greatest test of faith comes to us when life shows its worst side, and it comes, I think, supremely in old age, when the whole temptation of life is to feed on memory instead of on hope. The greatest witness of faith is old age, which has still the forward look. That your young men should see visions is no wonderful thing; that your old men should dream dreams is. Paul was never greater than in the closing stages of his life when he saw in his prison an opportunity, and his heart leapt out in thankfulness to take it.

But this same issue is always fought out when adversity appears, whether it comes in youth or in age. The difference between men and women is not the measure of adversity which comes to them, but what they do with adversity when it appears. In every life sooner or later 'the rains descend, the winds blow, and the floods arise'; for one man the house of life falls in ruins, for another it stands secure, and the difference lies not in the intensity of the storm, but in the power to withstand.

There is a fine story which is told of Marshal Foch, that one day when the position of things was critical, the further retreat would have endangered the whole line, one of his divisional generals sent him a message saying that he could not continue to hold a certain line of trenches which had become untenable, and in reply the Marshal sent him this message, 'If you can't hold on, you must advance.' It is a great motto for life, and the power to advance in such circumstances is where the great test comes.

And now if that is faith's greatest test, it is also by inevitable consequence the field where the greatest triumphs are won. What is the thing that we could least afford to lose out of the story of our lives or the story of the world? It is the record of the hard days. The victories which men

have won over against circumstances are the greatest stories in the world. One thinks of Milton in his blindness writing words like these :

I argue not
Against Heaven's hand or will, nor bate a jot
Of heart or hope, but still bear up and steer
Right onward.

One thinks of Beethoven in his deafness giving music for the ears of future ages. Or one turns to another field of life and thinks of James Watt, the great inventor, feeble in body and starving on a few shillings a week, saying, 'Of all things in life there is nothing more foolish than inventing.' Nearer still in time there is David Livingstone dragging a fever-stricken body over the wastes of Africa for a dream he had set out to attain. And you notice there are prisons in all these illustrations —the dark prison of blindness, the stony prison of deafness, the prisons of sickness and infirmity, but out of these have come the furtherance of poetry and music and invention and discovery.

These greater records in the story of faith have their own message to ourselves. In the end the greatness of life for all of us depends upon how we deal with that little phrase, 'the things which happened unto me.' Are we to be the victims of what happens, whether it be good or ill? Then we are among the defeated. Circumstances paint their image on our little lives, and the world has no gain from our living. Or are we conquerors, moulding conditions to our will? Then the world does gain.

Faith is not an explanation of things, but a spirit of life. It is not a key to the puzzle, but a great venture. In that spirit of life, in that venture there is the clearest light we can get upon the meaning of things? Is it not true that the light we crave upon this puzzling world is the reward, not of detached thought, but of great living?

We are not supplied with a definite creed at the beginning of the journey. The Master's call is 'Follow me,' and as we follow we begin to learn. Every day's life in His service adds something to our creed. Our views, as we call them, spring out of the things we have actually seen in our journeyings. Our beliefs rise from the things we have lived by. And so, slowly but very surely, we come to our own assurance.[1]

[1] S. M. Berry, *The Crucible of Experience*, 169.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Greek Catenae on the Pauline Epistles.

In his erudite article on 'Greek Patristic Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles' (Hastings' *D.B.*, Extra Vol., pp. 484–531), Dr. C. H. Turner acknowledges that no great advance can be made in the study of the Catenæ 'until more of the material that exists abundantly in the MSS has made its way into print.' Dr. Karl Staab, of the University of Munich, has already given the results of his examination of the Greek Catenæ on the Catholic Epistles in a volume published in 1924. He has recently laid students of the New Testament under further obligation by a comprehensive work on the Greek Catenæ on the Pauline Epistles.[1] He has had access to other MSS than those which are found in the libraries of Rome, and claims to have made use of 'at least three-fourths of the available material.'

The Catena Commentaries, which Dr. Staab has examined, are classified in two divisions and are named after the principal MS in each. Two types are recognized, the first being represented by MSS grouped under the three headings, Vaticanus, Monacensis, and Parisinus; the second by MSS grouped under the three headings, Nicetas, Œcumenius, and Theophylact. In each section there is a scholarly appreciation of the characteristic features and the value of each type, with a discussion of age and authorship. The Vatican Catena 762 (cf. Turner, *op. cit.*, p. 521) is held to be 'the most valuable as regards contents and form, and the most trustworthy witness to the text of the Pauline Epistles.' But Staab differs from Turner in his estimate of Vat. 692, which he regards as 'an offshoot from Vat. 762.'

The genuineness of the Œcumenian Catena on

[1] *Die Pauluskatenen* nach den handschriftlichen Quellen untersucht. Von Dr. Karl Staab, Privatdozent an der Universität München, pp. viii. 284. Mit sieben Tafeln in Lichtdruck (Roma: Verlag des päpstlichen Bibelinstituts).

St. Paul has been disputed. It is defended by Turner (*op. cit.*, p. 523). Staab is of opinion that Bardenhewer's article in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexikon* justifies his own speaking of 'the *Pseudo*-Œcumenian type.' To quote his final judgment: 'Œcumenius did certainly write a Commentary on all the Pauline Epistles in the form of short glosses on single words or phrases of the sacred text. The *scholia* which bear his name in the commentary in question are survivals from these comments. But the compilation, as a whole, cannot be ascribed to him.'

The last chapter of Staab's encyclopædic work is entitled *Pauline Exegesis in the Greek Church*. A survey of the material available is given, and the hope is expressed that further research will make accessible to all students of the New Testament the knowledge of the exegesis of the Greek Fathers which at present is hidden in many MSS of the Greek Catenæ.

Dr. Paul Feine's Monograph on St. Paul.

Nearly thirty years ago Professor Feine published the first-fruits of his Pauline studies: 'The Gospel of Paul'; it was followed by 'Jesus Christ and Paul' (1902), and 'Paul as Theologian' (1906). His 'Theology of the New Testament' is now in its fourth edition. In the 'Series of Scientific Monographs,' edited by Dr. A. Schlatter and Dr. W. Lütgert, his latest work[1] appears, and in it he reaffirms the main principles of exegesis which underlie his earlier writings, although, as he says, 'in the course of my theological development my outlook has been widened and deepened.'

In Part I. the various theological interpretations of Paul are classified under four headings: writers whose studies may be described as 'intellectual and didactic' include such names as Neander, Baur, Beyschlag, and Harnack; amongst those who belong to the 'historico-religious' school are Eichhorn, Wendland, Eduard Meyer, and Bousset; only three names of those who have written from the 'eschatological' point of view are given, namely, Kabisch, Teichmann, and Schweitzer. In the fourth section the transition from the theological to the religious study of the Apostle is traced from Nösgen to Karl Barth. Other writers included are Titius, Weinel, Johannes Weiss, Deissmann, and Feine himself. References to non-German authors would have been welcome, but it is no small gain to have, in a single volume, clear statements of the views of nearly fifty scholars, accompanied by appreciations or criticisms of their conclusions. These summaries will be valuable for reference both to those who agree with and to those who differ from Feine's exposition.

Part II. is constructive. Feine answers *historically* the question: 'Is Paul a true disciple of Jesus who continued His work, or did he obscure the Christian religion by intermingling with it foreign elements, whether Jewish, Greek, or Oriental?' To arrive at an historical understanding of Paul, the New Testament evidence of his relation to the early Church and of his dependence on Jesus is carefully investigated; the early Christians' hope of redemption is then viewed in the light of the history of religions; and in a final chapter it is argued that in order to understand Paul historically it is essential to begin with his faith in God and from that starting-point to trace the lines of development in his theology.

There are judgments expressed by Feine to which some of those who agree with his central position will be unable to assent. For example, Deissmann's distinction between 'action' and 'reaction' in religious experience has proved illuminating to many who will dissent from the strictures passed upon it; and in general it may be said that full justice is not done to the mystical elements in Paulinism.

The strength of Feine's argument will be found in his insistence upon the historical probability that a broad stream of common faith united Paul with the early Christian Church. Emphasis is laid, not upon what separates Paul from Jesus and the primitive Church, but upon what unites him to the faith of the early Christians. It must suffice in this brief notice to summarize the main conclusion to which Feine's investigations have brought him. It is acknowledged that there is something distinctive both in Paul's faith and in his theology. 'He was the first Christian who elaborated certain conceptions, indeed, one may say certain dogmatic statements.' But to Paul no 'inward metamorphosis' of the Christian religion is to be ascribed. Pauline teaching is not out of line with early presentations of the Christian faith.

J. G. Tasker.

Leamington Spa.

[1] *Der Apostel Paulus*: Das Ringen um das geschichtliche Verständnis des Paulus. Von Dr. Paul Feine, Professor der Theologie in der Universität Halle-Wittenberg. Sammlung wissenschaftlicher Monographien, Band 12 (pp. viii. 624. Paper, M.20; cloth, M.23. Verlag von C. Bertelsmann in Gütersloh).

Vital Values of the Cross.

By the Reverend Albert D. Belden, B.D., Westcliff-on-Sea.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the sayings of St. Paul concerning the Cross of the Lord Jesus Christ do not represent mere theorizing about that extraordinary event; they represent, rather, the values which that Cross came to have for him in his daily life. They were the current coin of the Apostle's life—reflections of his daily experience of the power of Christ to save. We shall never do justice to St. Paul's meaning until we cease to regard these classic passages upon the Cross merely as theology and begin to see them as records of the plain everyday effect of the Cross, not only upon his own mind and life, but upon the minds and lives of his fellow-Christians. Such an understanding of them would leave us face to face with the question: why should not the Cross of Christ project itself into our own life also with just these values?

One can imagine St. Paul standing over against this modern religious world of ours and crying wistfully, in the eloquent words that F. W. H. Myers has put into his mouth:

> Oh could I tell ye surely would believe it!
> Oh could I only say what I have seen!
> How should I tell or how can ye receive it,
> How, till he bringeth you where I have been?

From the famous passage contained in Ro 5 we can select three sentences which enshrine, in an impressive sequence, the three supreme values of the Cross, for St. Paul and indeed for all men:

'God commendeth his own love toward us.'
'While we were yet sinners, Christ died for us.'
'Saved by his life.'

Here we see St. Paul deriving from the Cross of Jesus an assurance of Divine Love—an unveiling and judgment of human sin, and a gift of Divine Grace.

I.

In the Cross there is the vital value of an *overwhelming assurance of Divine Love.* Were our imaginations equal to the task, it would be a useful experiment to endeavour to re-write the history of the Christian centuries, minus the Cross of Christ: one wonders how much of the history would be worth recording!

There are some people, even Christian people, who say, very unthinkingly, 'it wasn't Christ's death that mattered, but His life.' But how would His life have appeared without that sublime conclusion? We should have had the history of a noble teacher, whose sincerity and spirit were never put to final proof. That would be the situation at its best, for it is very doubtful whether Jesus could have avoided death in any honourable way. The truth is, of course, that these two things cannot be severed: the death is all of a piece with the life, it is part of one perfect witness: and as the death without the life and the teaching would be meaningless, so the teaching and the life without the death, *in the absence of that response from humanity for which Jesus looked,* would have been unfruitful. They would have missed their crowning demonstration and most amazing confirmation.

The very least that can be said about the Cross of Jesus takes us a very long way indeed. It is that Jesus died in witness to the Love of God for humanity which filled His own soul to overflowing. Nothing could be plainer or simpler than that. Nowhere in human history do we find a greater lover of men than Jesus, and always He traces that Love of His to its source in the heart of the All-Father.

Let us ask ourselves, upon what ground would we believe that God is Love if we had not Jesus to turn to, if we had not for a supreme argument: Jesus, crucified for Love's sake? Should we turn to the other world religions? Can we fall back upon Buddhism, or Muhammadanism, or Hinduism, or Confucianism? Would it not indeed be a fall? The very fact that not one of these religions rises to the level of becoming *a real religion of the spirit,* but remains on the level of law and regulation, with next to no idea of redemptive aid from God for the sinful soul, renders their witness to the Divine Love hopelessly inadequate to meet the vital needs of mankind. In every one of these faiths man may lift himself to God by awful and sublime struggle, if he can do so. He is not encouraged to believe that God stoops in pity and in power to save.

Shall we look to philosophy to convince us that God is Love? It can certainly provide us with some pretty arguments making in that direction, arguments that can stimulate and encourage a faith that is already in being. Its most valuable argument, however, turns upon the reality of the

moral ideal, as it registers itself in the minds of men. But that reality expresses itself in humanity mainly in the form of condemnation. It is the reproach of an *unattained* ideal.

If, in all human history, there is no record of any achievement that reaches and satisfies the ideal, then a great burden is put upon belief in the objective reality of that ideal, or, at least, in the possibility of its ever being achieved.

On the other hand, should there be discoverable in history one life in which aspiration and the moral ideal have kissed each other in the embrace of a perfect achievement, then human faith receives a mighty reinforcement. Such is the vital value of the stainless record of Christ, more especially as it is sustained in face of the torture and death of the Cross. If that is not true, the reality of the moral ideal is left in heavy subjective shadow, a hint, a promise, a vague possibility with a minimum of power to save; but if it be true, then, indeed, it becomes the 'power of God unto salvation.'

If, then, God is to be judged by what has come forth from Him in visible creation—Jesus crucified is the highest and surest guarantee of the Creator's Redeeming Love that we possess.

Christ thus meets our fundamental need, for unless we can believe that God is Love there is no hope for any of us. A mere Taskmaster-God, an arbitrary Sovereign, however holy, working upon mankind by the sole motive of fear, will never save us from sin. Such a God can never afford us that escape from self-interest, in which alone lies the hope of salvation for the individual and for society. But how obsolete becomes such a God in the light of the Cross of Jesus! 'Shall a man be more pure than his maker?' If there is no God of Love, then this supreme Lover of us all must actually be exalted to Godhead and made henceforth the soul and centre of our universe. 'We needs must love the highest when we see it.' But let the soul only linger at the Cross of Jesus and how sure it must grow of the Divine Love! For here 'God commendeth his own love toward us.' It is here that you may come in the worst hours of life to find that it is no mere spectator-God who calls upon you to suffer, but one who declares 'in all their afflictions I am afflicted,' and who in His suffering 'heals and hallows all our woe,' and breathes into us the spirit that can conquer the worst by an invincible faith in the best.

II.

The second vital value that we can perceive in the Cross of Christ is *its terrific judgment of sin.* It is, indeed, amazing how sin gathers about Jesus in this final crisis, how it hems in the sinless one and does its worst and vilest to Him. Judas and Peter wounding Him in the house of His friends! Pharisees, scribes, and priests—representatives of ecclesiastical corruption and hypocrisy! Herod and Pilate—representatives of the crass tyranny and expediency of so-called justice! The mob—that multitude that had moved Him to compassion, and whose misery it had been the object of His constant ministry to relieve—swayed by basest passion of cruelty! Militarism, mob-passion, perversion of justice, private tyranny, personal cowardice, vile avarice, lying and every manner of deceit! Here indeed is a muster of all the powers of darkness hurling themselves at the purest and the best, so that it seems no exaggeration to declare, 'Behold the Lamb of God, which beareth away *the sin of the world*!'

Yet how subtle is this judgment of God upon sin! Sin is given the rein and permitted to do its worst against the simple goodness and unquenchable Love of Christ, and the rest of history is left to proclaim with ever-increasing volume the utter futility of sin's vaunted power. Think what sheer confidence of power is reflected in these words, 'whilst we were yet sinners Christ died for us.' How soon the pierced hands begin to pluck the fruitage of their pain! The centurion from the very foot of the Cross, the disciples from their flight of fear, three thousand at Pentecost, hundreds of thousands more within a century, and a multitude that no man can number standing to-day with Christ at the right hand of God! Sin is indeed judged in history at the Cross of Christ. It is the watershed of the ages.

How is it judged, also, in human hearts that gather here as they see that Love pierced, tortured, and slain! The very wrath of God against sin is transferred to the breast of the sinner, and in the believing soul a penitence arises which becomes an abiding hate of sin. We moderns have not, perhaps, done justice to this vital value of the Cross. Dr. Lyman Abbott in a great passage upon this aspect in his *Christ and Evolution*, says:

> 'It is the evil which sin brings upon men that brings sorrow to our hearts rather than sin itself. Nor shall we come to a moral state, worthy of the children of God, until we have taken these two factors—the wrath against sin and pity because of sin, and found a way to unite them in one common experience, for mercy is not merely pity for a sinful man. It is the pity of wrath. Mercy is hate pitying.'

There are few more searching questions for the human soul than how far it so loves goodness as really to hate sin? What is your hatred of lying, of cruelty, of impurity, of treachery and disloyalty of every kind? Tell me that and I can tell you if you are saved and safe. It takes this vision of what sin really is in its out-working—innocence defiled and crushed, ineffable Love pierced and bleeding, infinite compassion spat upon and rejected—to awaken our deluded hearts to the true values. Do you not feel that in every fight against sin in your own life, and in your own day and generation, you need this vision abiding with you so that, however sweet and fair sin may appear in its favourite disguise as an angel of light, you may always see it driving the nails into the hands of Love, crushing the thorns down upon Love's brow, piercing Love's side, spitting foully upon Love's purity, and so come to hate it as only Perfect Love can hate, and thus become able to break for ever and always with that which is anti-Christ? 'Now is the prince of this world judged.'

III.

Thus a third vital value for life that we find in the Cross of Christ is *the gift of grace.* When such Love finds one's soul and stirs within it such hate of sin, what passion of longing is aroused for a new life, and indeed a new being that can answer such love and become in its hands 'a flaming sword to fight through the world!' This passionate longing too is answered, for the Love that speaks from the Cross is not conquered by death nor overcome by sin. It is an ever-living Love and an undiminished Power.

If we feel that our past, however sinful, can be left to the atoning passion of this Love, working not only in and through us but throughout the universe, we can also lift our eyes to the future and believe that by His grace we, too, can conquer sin and sorrow and death. See how St. Paul repeats this thrilling thought in this chapter. 'If, while we were enemies, we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be saved by his life.' 'If, by the trespass of the one, death reigned through the one; much more shall they that receive the abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one, even Jesus Christ.'

There is a supernatural grace available for the soul that will really break with sin and embrace in fullest faith the Love of God. If Christ's sacrifice upon the Cross proves His Love and wins our hearts from sin, how much more shall He, Himself, prove His love by our perfect salvation. It is ours to believe in this grace, this Other, Greater Life descending in ever new glory of character upon the soul, transforming it from glory to glory till it is perfected in His likeness!

Thus the Cross becomes in our life the perpetual guarantee of the presence of such living power. This is the most vital value of all. The Cross brings us into new personal daily association with God, so that it becomes true of us that 'if any man is in Christ Jesus he is a new creation.' The measure of what that power is prepared to do for us is to be found in the suffering Christ. A God who can suffer like that for love of you and me will not stint His power as we seek to live in daily obedience to His Spirit. Whatever, then, be the forces arrayed against us in our own soul or in the world, let us go forth to meet them in remembrance of the crucified, and we shall discover that 'in this sign we conquer.'

Contributions and Comments.

New Light on Palestine, c. 2000 B.C.

In an article published lately by Kurt Sethe,[1] reviewed and annotated by M. René Dussaud,[2] we are furnished with some new texts recently discovered in Egypt, containing a list of certain districts, towns, and peoples in Palestine and Syria, towards the close of the XIth Dynasty (*c.* 2000 B.C.). The value of these texts to the Old Testament student is that they make mention of certain Biblical peoples and towns at this early date. The texts, which were discovered in a Theban tomb, have been written with ink, in the ancient hieratic script. They occur, not on pot-sherds or *ostraka*, which were generally used—after

[1] Kurt Sethe, 'Die Aechtung feindlicher Fürsten, Völker und Dinge auf altaegyptischen Tongefaess-scherben des Mittleren Reiches, nach den Originalen im Berliner Museum hrsgg. und erklaert,' in *Abhandl. Berl. Akad.*, 1926, philos.-hist. Klasse, Nr. 5, Berlin.

[2] René Dussaud, *Syria*, VIII. iii. p. 216 ff.

the XVIIIth Dynasty at least—for ordinary purposes when papyrus was not available, but on complete vases which appear to have been broken, in accordance probably with customary magical rites, when they were deposited in the tomb. We have already, of course, a large amount of geographical and other information regarding Palestine as far back as the middle of the second millennium in the Tell el-Amarna Tablets, the Egyptian Annals of the XVIIIth and XIXth Dynasties, the report of the Egyptian commissioner Unamūn, and the travels of a *Maher* recorded in the Papyrus Anastasi. But the texts to which we refer are much older, carrying us back to the end of the third millennium, about the time of the first Babylonian Dynasty (*c.* 2169 B.C.), or of Abraham's migration from 'Ur of the Chaldees' (*c.* 2090 B.C.).

Perhaps the most interesting mention is that of a people called *Iy'nḳ*, a name which is apparently identical with 'Anak or 'Anakim in the Old Testament (עֲנָק, עֲנָקִים, Ἐνάκ-ιμ). As this people, the 'Anak' (always with the article, except in Dt 9^2, Nu 13^{33}, JE), is spoken of in some Biblical passages as a race of giants, most Biblical critics have regarded their existence as somewhat unhistorical and belonging to the region of fable. Others, such as Renan, have included them among the Hittites who were found in the south of Canaan, especially the part around Hebron. But these Theban texts oblige us to correct these views and to establish the 'Anakim in their proper place as an historical people. The mention of them at this remote epoch proves that they were a race of undoubted antiquity and must not be confused with the Hittites, who do not appear in history till about 500 years later. The texts speak of them as being ruled by three princes, by which is doubtless meant that they were spread over three principal cities, each with its ruling prince. This accords with Jos 11^{21}, where their three cities are given: Hebron (Kirjath-Arba),[1] Debir (Kirjath-Sepher), and Anab; and we may thus conclude that the 'Anakim were west of the Jordan by 2000 B.C., a fact which has often been disputed. The new information accords also with Jos 15^{14} (cf. Jg 1^{10}), where the 'Anakim are mentioned as having three princes, Sheshai,[2] Aḥiman, and Talmai, 'descendants of Anak.' The names of the princes at the date of the Theban texts, according to Dussaud's transliteration, are given as 'Elem, 'Akram (cf. Nu 1^{13}), and Abi-ma-'Ammu. In this last, 'Ammu is a Babylonian god mentioned frequently in contemporary names of the first Babylonian dynasty (cf. Hammurabi). He must have been worshipped by the 'Anakim, and must have played an important rôle in Palestine at this early date, as he figures in several of the texts. Though the 'Anakim are generally referred to in the Old Testament as 'giants' (LXX γίγαντες), the passage in Jos 15^{13-15} (JE), whose historical accuracy is so singularly corroborated by the Theban texts, makes no reference to them as such. It is only in the later traditions that this characteristic appears. Probably they were long-necked, tall men, as the name implies (ענק = 'neck'), but the difference between them and men of normal size must have been less than tradition imagined. Evidence goes to show that prehistoric people were not larger than those now living.

Another interesting name in these Theban texts is that of Jerusalem. It occurs under a form which Sethe transliterates אוּשׁלִם. This form is quite unknown, but M. Montet has shown that, in the Egyptian compound represented here by אוּ, the two letters must be transposed, as their present order is due to the difficulties of the Egyptian script, and that א must take the sound of *r*. We thus have the Assyrian *Ursalimmu*, 'the city or abode of peace,' where the double *m* is due to the syllabic nature of the cuneiform writing, or *Urusalim*, as it is in the Tell el-Amarna Tablets. The occurrence of the name in this form as far back as the third millennium seems to show, as critics have often suggested, that the form Salem (שָׁלֵם) in Gn 14^{18} is a poetic archaism. The texts give us the names of two chiefs who ruled the city, viz. *Yaḳar-'Ammu*, 'the god 'Ammu is majestic,' and *Set-'Anu*. In this second name 'Anu is a masculine deity corresponding to the feminine 'Anat, and his existence among the western Semites, though only suspected hitherto by scholars,[3] is thus proved. A noticeable feature of the two names is that there is nothing in them to signify the idea of 'righteousness' (צֶדֶק), which is believed to have been associated with the rulers of Jerusalem from the time at least of Melchizedek ('king of righteousness') onwards (cf. Gn 14^{18}, Is 1^{26}, Jer 31^{23} 50^7), unless 'Set'

[1] In Jos 15^{13} the A.V. calls Hebron 'the city of Arba, the father of Anak' (cf. 21^{11}), but the LXX reading 'Kirjath-Arba (capital) of the Anakim' is preferable. The idea that the city was called after a man named Arba, the progenitor of the 'Anakim or the great man in their traditional history, is probably incorrect, although it was doubtless built by them (cf. Moore in *Inter. Crit. Com.*: Jg 1^{10}).

[2] The name Sheshai is probably identical with Shimshai (Babylonian Shamshai) in Ezr 4^8. The Babylonian *msh* frequently becomes *sh*.

[3] Clay, *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 117; Albright, *Amer. Journ. of Semit. Lang.*, 1925, p. 86.

be a hypocoristic form of *Ṣad-uk*, the native word for 'righteousness' in the Tell el-Amarna Letters. The principal fact of value, however, is that, if Sethe's transcription be correct, we have here external evidence that the city of Jerusalem was in existence in Abraham's day, 600 or more years before the conquest under Joshua.

One of the names in the texts is transliterated *Ḫelek* by Dussaud. This name occurs in the Old Testament (Nu 26^{30}, Jos 17^{2}, 1 Ch 7^{19}), and on the Samaria *ostraka* of king Ahab's time. In the Old Testament it is represented by the redactor as a clan or tribal division of Manasseh, but on the *ostraka* it appears as a town. That all the so-called 'sons' or clans of Manasseh mentioned in the above passages were really towns, as shown by the *ostraka*, is now corroborated by the mention of *Ḫelek* in these texts as a town. The names, indeed, of its two chiefs are given, *Yaḳar-damu* and *Shemesh-elim*. It is apparent that it had been in existence over a thousand years before Ahab's time (*c.* 875 B.C.), and one cannot therefore find in it the name of a son of Manasseh.

If Sethe's and Dussaud's interpretations be correct, we have also mention of the Amorites (*Iym'wr*), whose territory extended at this time from Syria to the Euphrates, and of the Sutu (*Šwtw*), who were a strong nomad tribe of the Syrian desert, as well as of several Biblical towns besides Jerusalem, such as Askelon, Byblos (Gebal), and Reḥob, and about thirty personal names, two of which are compounded with *ilu* ('God'). A careful examination of the texts goes to show that towards the end of the third millennium B.C. the Semites ('Amorite' may have been a general term applied to them all) completely dominated the Palestinian and Syrian regions, and that many localities bore the same names as we find in Biblical times many centuries later. J. W. JACK.

Glenfarg, Perthshire.

Mark x. 18.

THIS has always been a difficult text to interpret. I submit the following as an attempt to give its true meaning. My solution is, of course, in no sense original, but it may be that the way in which the solution is reached will tend to make the meaning clearer.

Supposing we received a reply from a stranger to whom we had written, saying, 'Why do you call me "dear"? No one is dear to you except in your own circle of loved ones.' In our surprise we should rejoin, 'Surely you do not object to our conventional use of the word. Almost every one uses it in the opening of a letter. It is common courtesy.'

In like manner the rich young ruler might have replied to the Lord, 'I called you "good" out of courtesy. Granted what you say about God is correct, why should you take me to task for being courteous?' Perhaps our Lord's reply would have run as follows: 'I want you to think out the actual meaning of what you say. I do not quarrel with your courteous address; but I do wish you to realize what "good" in its absolute and highest sense means. I draw your attention to that because I wish you to understand what keeping the Law really means. You have kept the Commandments well up to a point. But you do not realize that, in order to gain eternal life, you must keep them all in a spirit of loving self-sacrifice. In your case your riches are a hindrance to this. Get rid of *them*, come and follow *me*, and you will realize as never before what it really means to obey the Commandments.'

Now a few days later Jesus gave the Parable of the Talents. We might imagine one of His disciples who followed His teachings closely and intelligently, saying, 'Master, you have described the servants as being good and faithful. But only the other day you told that rich young man that only God is good. How do you reconcile your statements?' Jesus would reply, 'You must remember that the word "good" is relative. It has various shades of meaning. I did not mean that the servants were good as God is. (I did not even mean that they were good as I am, in that they never sinned.) But they were faithful to their Master, and their very faithfulness earned for them the title "good." I put to the young man the question I did for a special purpose, which, perhaps, you saw as the conversation proceeded.'

I have bracketed one sentence because I think it unlikely that Jesus would have made such a bald declaration about Himself. But this sentence, and the imagined discussion, may help us to understand that He did not disclaim sinlessness by Mk 10^{18}.

In one sense of the word, God alone can be called 'good.' We must bear in mind, too, that the human life which Jesus lived would not prevent His making mistakes through ignorance; and this would undoubtedly prevent His claiming the absolute goodness of God. But it would not prevent the claim that He lived a life in which He was like His brethren in all things 'except without sin.' F. B. WESTBROOK.

Worcester.

Floor (Matt. viii. 20).[1]

In the January number of The Expository Times you were good enough to review my book *An Old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew's Gospel*, and also in your 'Notes of Recent Exposition' to comment on one of the interesting variants found in the translated manuscript. It is with reference to the latter that I ask leave to trespass on the hospitality of your columns, as I feel that the reading you have selected for criticism hardly does justice to the thesis I was endeavouring to support. The subject of Gospel Origins and Gospel Priority is of immense importance, and any fresh evidence that comes to us is worthy of the most careful scrutiny.

The reading 'floor' in the Hebrew Text (Mt 8^{20}), which you have criticised, is certainly not one on which a satisfactory theory of a Hebrew original could be based if it stood alone. Nevertheless, your comment that 'it looks as though the translator has taken liberties with his text' appears to me to be unwarranted. If the translator had found the usual, but rather vague, *ouk echei pou* of the Greek, it would have been easy for him to render it into Hebrew with Delitzsch (מקום). That he has given us 'floor' instead of 'place' is very strange if it be not an original touch. The sense of the passage surely demands something as realistic as 'holes' and 'nests.' I agree that the point of the utterance is not that Jesus was stricken with poverty, but rather that for Him there was not that certain rest to which God's creatures and the poorest wayfarer were entitled. Left at that, it is an expressive and pathetic plea and need not be interpreted too literally. Far from being unwarranted, the reading correctly rounds off the remark.

For definite evidence of a Hebrew original, however, I would lay far more emphasis on the additional name Abner in the Genealogy (1^{13}), which restores Matthew's arrangement of fourteen names in the third group, and upon the play on the Hebrew words קיץ ('summer fruit') and קץ ('end') in 24^{32}. These, to my mind, offer conclusive proofs.

Hugh Schonfield.

London.

[1] We have pleasure in allowing Mr. Schonfield to develop his view, but in spite of it we adhere to our opinion that the theory of a Hebrew original underlying St. Matthew's text is unlikely. In any case, it seems to be more likely that 'floor' (קרקע) shows the hand of a translator from the Greek than that, being in the original text, it disappeared from the Greek translation. Mr. Schonfield himself allows that קרקע is a vivid and realistic term as compared with מקום ('place').—Editor.

A Silent East Wind.

'And it came to pass, when the sun did arise, that God prepared a vehement (A.V. m., *silent*; R.V. *sultry*; LXX, *burning*; elsewhere, *hot, cutting*) east wind; and the sun beat upon the head of Jonah, that he fainted, and wished in himself to die' (Jonah 4^{8}).

The Hebrew word *ḥărîshîth*, rendered 'vehement' in the A.V., has proved to be a stumbling-block to translators. The *Oxford Hebrew Lexicon* is not helpful: 'Adj. meaning wholly dubious; only in Jonah 4^{8}; *a silent east wind* is not suitable in context; *still—sultry* is mere conjecture. . . . We make no attempt to explain.'

Is it not probable that the explanation is to be found in the local conditions? Old residents in Bible lands well know the 'east wind'—the *sirocco* or *khamseen*—in both its moods. There is, first, the 'vehement' kind which appears to have been the only east wind known to the translators of 1611—'a hot wind from the bare heights of the wilderness . . . a full wind . . . come up as clouds, and his chariots as the whirlwind' (Jer 4^{1}). When this boisterous sirocco is 'full,' the sun is obscured by the sand-laden air which hangs over everything, yellow and thick like a London fog. To open your door to go out is to meet a blast as from a furnace. Men faint, not from the beating of the sun's rays upon them, but from the withering heat of the atmosphere. Clearly, these conditions do not fit into the verse—'And the sun beat upon the head of Jonah.'

They also know the quiet, still mornings when not a breath of the hot air which envelops all can ruffle the daintiest leaf in the garden. There is no sound or motion of this silent, burning wind. A very slight haze, so far from moderating, seems but to accentuate the power of the sun's rays. Generally a cooling breeze, giving movement and relief, springs up about nine o'clock. It is in these conditions, at an early hour of the day, when the beams of the climbing sun strike obliquely upon the back of the neck, and upon the temple, that sunstrokes are common. The victim becomes delirious, and almost invariably displays a strong tendency to suicide. This is exactly what happened to Jonah.

The author had a thorough knowledge of local conditions; but he had something more than that—the sure touch of a poet in his choice of terms. The 'vehement' of the A.V. is quite wrong: the 'sultry' of the R.V. is more correct, but is commonplace and ugly: 'silent' is both true and colourful.

J. Davies Bryan.

Alexandria, Egypt.

James iii. 6.

With reference to the emendation of Ja 3^6 suggested by Dr. Rendall and reviewed in the December issue of The Expository Times, may I suggest τρόπος γένεσεως, or rather τὸν τρόπον τῆς γένεσεως as an alternative? There is no exact parallel, but there is the phrase, quoted by Liddell and Scott, τρόπῳ φρενός, meaning 'according to one's way or humour.' This suggestion requires the change of only one letter, π for χ, and would give the sense of 'natural disposition.'

D. S. Robertson.

St. Andrews.

Entre Nous.

Homer Lane.

'A man who was so simple that only children could understand him, so good that his worth was more apparent to the foolish than to the wise, so generous that no one could injure him, so modest that no one could praise him, so trusting that no one could deceive him, so happy that nothing could depress him, so great that no one could for long feel small in his presence.' These are the words of Lord Lytton in his introduction to Miss Bazeley's *Homer Lane and the Little Commonwealth* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). We gave some account of the Little Commonwealth last month when writing of Homer Lane's 'Talks.'

A Good Citizen.

'Edmund was an undersized boy whose appearance reminded one strongly of the picture at the Tate Gallery of a wistful street urchin entitled "His First Offence." He was partly French and partly English in origin, with a Cockney stepfather. He was a glib little liar, and whenever the discovery was made that a family larder or the shop had been raided, most people suspected the hand of Edmund. For months after he came to the Commonwealth his work was bad, and he could never be trusted to do it properly. . . . Later, Edmund got a permanent job on the farm and gradually his work improved; as the farmyard became tidier he himself became steadier. . . . His house-mother learned to count on him as one who would always meet his share of the family bills. Then, one day, he told me he had saved 19s. 11d., and did I think I could buy a blue serge suit for him for that sum. On Saturday I went to all the outfitters' shops in Sherborne, and at last was thrilled to find a blue serge suit, just Edmund's size, for 19s. 6d. For two proud Sundays Edmund wore his suit. In another month's time his mother was to come to the Commonwealth on a visit. Then a family crisis occurred in Bramble. Several of the newer citizens had been doing badly, and had not earned enough to pay their share of the weekly bills. The older members of the family, who were earning good wages, put all their resources to helping the weaker ones to pay their share of the family bills. Edmund had no savings to give, as he had only recently bought his suit. In spite of everybody's struggles, there was still a deficit of 13s. 6d., Chicken's unpaid share of the bill. Chicken was an unmannerly boy at that time, who had made himself disagreeable to most people, and perhaps more especially so to Edmund. Without saying a word to anybody, Edmund fetched his new suit, went to the shop with it, said he wanted to give it back, got 13s. 6d. for it, returned across the courtyard to his house-mother and presented her with the sum for Chicken's dues. Long after supper Chicken, who had run away early in the morning to the Downs, crept in and up the stairs to the boys' landing to go to bed. To his amazement he found that the score against him had been completely wiped off, that he no longer had to face old troubles, that it was, in a sense, a new family which readmitted him, without comment, and in a friendly fashion, to its circle. I think that the boys and girls of the Commonwealth had deeper experiences of the Christian function of reciprocal forgiveness than some of the eminent Christians in the outside world who, at a later date, were condemning the management of the Commonwealth for not punishing the misdemeanours of the citizens with adequate severity.'[1]

Mr. Bruce Barton on 'The Church Nobody Knows.'

In the book by Mr. Bruce Barton, reviewed on another page, *What can a Man Believe?* there is

[1] E. T. Bazeley, *Homer Lane and the Little Commonwealth*, 109.

a chapter on 'The Church Nobody Knows,' which is at least worth pondering. It is written by a business man—readers will remember that Mr. Barton is the son of Dr. W. E. Barton, the well-beloved Safed the Sage. Mr. Barton states frankly what in his eyes are the main defects of the present-day Church. The first is a lack of honesty.

'There is hardly a church membership roll anywhere that does not carry as active members a large percentage of people who are no longer active. Some have ceased to attend; some have moved away; some have been lost from sight entirely. Yet their names continue to be carried and go to swell the misleading totals which give the annual impression that the Church is gaining, or at least holding its own.'

Secondly, the Church has not as much faith as business has. Many businesses spend large sums on scientific investigation the results of which are to render their products out of date. But they believe in *change*. They have only one fear, that the future (which they know will be different) should find them unprepared. Business *knows* that to-morrow will be different; the Church is merely *afraid* it will be. 'It "must maintain its work," and in the puff and flurry of that effort it too often does not stop to ask: "Is this work, which was a service when it was instituted a hundred years ago, a service now? or could our energy be turned to other and more useful channels?"'

Further, the Church is not, as business is, flexible and adaptable. Take its morning service. That was begun in days when the pastor was the news-giver, the librarian, the instructor, the whole source of illumination to the people, and the Church the sole medium of social intercourse. To-day things are different. And the real reason for the difficulty with which the ordinary morning service is kept up is just this change. We ask people to come together for an hour or more at a time, and we pre-empt the very middle of Sunday, spoiling both forenoon and afternoon for those who want to be in the open air. The Roman Church is wiser. Early or late one may step through the door and bow in the sanctuary for a few moments, coming out refreshed and strengthened. The Roman Church makes little of the sermon; the Protestant Church makes everything of it.

Finally, business is greatly concerned about the quality of the men who enter its ranks. There can be no permanent success with poor men. This is one of the chief problems of the Church, because the ministry no longer attracts the best men. Why? Partly because of the 'absurd hurdles' 'that are are put up and that keep strong men out—the traditional emphasis upon creed. A convention of ministers gathers to examine candidates, and what is the first question? Frequently it is: "Do you believe in the Virgin Birth?" This is an important part of Church doctrine for many people, but was it important to Jesus? The record does not say so. Did He stand at the door of Matthew's feast and stop all comers, saying, "Just a minute; do you believe in the Virgin Birth? If not, you may not enter."'

Another is the conditions of service, the kind of tasks that are given a minister to do to-day.

'To be the private chaplain of twenty-five or fifty families; to make pastoral calls and attend meetings of women's auxiliaries; to conduct a prayer meeting for a dozen completely saved and sanctified old people; to live shabbily and be worried about the education of his children and the burdens of old age—this is not the life to appeal to a high-spirited man. There is no lift in it, no power, nothing to tempt a man to trade for it the only life on earth that he will ever have.'

What of these criticisms? Are they valid? Do they really reflect the floating opinions of multitudes of men and women who are not unreligious and not fundamentally antagonistic to the Church?

The Minister of the Future.

'The pastor himself is a remarkable character. He wears no special uniform, but you would not need to have him pointed out in order to know that he is a pastor. His face reveals it; there is something in his expression which proclaims him as a confident citizen of two worlds. He is about fifty years of age, for no man reaches the ministry in these days until he is well on toward forty! It is recognized as the greatest and most honoured of all the professions, and one must have proved superior qualities in business or professional work before even being admitted into training. The training consists of a study of the Bible and particularly the life of Christ, followed by two or three years of travel, part of it in the Orient, where mysticism has always had its home, and men find it somehow easier to forget themselves in the contemplation of the Infinite.'[1]

Christ at the Round Table.

Christ at the Round Table, by Mr. E. Stanley Jones (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net), is a beautiful

[1] Bruce Barton, *What can a Man Believe?* 158.

book, and happily it is certain of a warm and eager welcome. 'The Christ of the Indian Road' made that assured. Yet, in some ways, this is the bigger and the better book of the two.

Twenty years went to the making of it, twenty difficult years for the Church of Christ, which has had to adjust itself to the new outlook of a new world—twenty years in which a missionary who went to India only to teach has learned to learn as well, and teaches Christ now, so he finds, far better and with more assurance, because of the fruits of his new catholicity of mind.

Learned what? Such facts as that the religion of India, even of its common people, centres round, not the temples, but the clean austerity of the Upanishads, and the moral loveliness of the Bhagavadgita; that no people in the world have so brooded on the depths of things ('there are more words for philosophic and religious thought in Sanskrit than in Greek and Latin and German put together'); that 'the deep things of Religion need a sympathetic atmosphere'; but that 'the final issue is not between the systems of Christianity and Hinduism, but between Christlikeness and un-Christlikeness' wherever these are found; and so on.

One day a Hindu gentleman asked, 'How can I find Christ?' From that intimate talk sprang the idea of holding innumerable little round-table conferences of Christians and non-Christians, who should give each his testimony as to what religion is, and has accomplished in his experience—a kind of 'clinic of souls.'

Extraordinarily picturesque are the vivid portraits of the diverse souls that have gathered together in these little groups.

It looked a dangerous thing to come so close to these watchful eyes. But it has been entirely justified. For if, as the result of all the frankness, many hopeful things have risen to the surface—man's innate religiousness for one—the two facts that stand out are, first, that 'at the close everything else had been pushed to the edges as irrelevant, and Christ controlled the situation'; and, second, that what the non-Christians could contribute proved deeply disappointing and much less than Mr. Stanley Jones had expected and hoped. As a Hindu said, 'Eight of us have spoken, and none of us has found; five of you have spoken, and you all seem to have found.' Indeed, thinking that to test things fairly he must come face to face with the very best the other faiths can produce, Mr. Jones has gone seeking any one who can tell him of any one in their faiths who has 'found,' as Christians 'find' in Christ, has gone up and up, until at last he had long moving interviews with Gandhi himself. And he has come upon not one who claims so to have found—not one.

Mr. Stanley Jones has boldly thrown his faith into the hottest of testing fires, and has discovered, so he claims, that it alone is producing conversions and changed lives, it alone has a programme for the redemption of the world, it alone has a God who 'has Himself entered by the Narrow Gate' of sacrifice, and 'obeyed His own law.' But, above all, in these conferences Mr. Jones has had borne in on him the immensity of Jesus Christ. He pleads with us to live Him out, to build, not upon theory, but experience; he tells us that, despite our endless sects, we 'Christians are the most united people upon earth,' and need not bother as we do about the surface differences; he cries to us that missions are still by far 'too foreign-managed,' and begs us to get alongside India, even transliterating a great saying into this: 'being in the form of a white man, counts it not a thing to be grasped at to be on an equality with the dominant race, but empties himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of the men to whom he goes; and being found in fashion as an Indian . . .' which he conceives to be a Christian's duty yonder. Passionately he pleads for the spirit of the Cross, and ends on the triumphant assurance that Christ's way is the only way, and that in Christ all lesser rays are lost and blended into the Light of the World.

This is a finely written book, immeasurably quotable, full of apt illustrations culled from a very wide experience, and devoted to Jesus Christ. It ought to give salt to innumerable sermons, and an impetus towards deeper things to many minds.

'The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto . . .'

'As we went in to see the institution, we were taken first of all into the little chapel for quiet prayer. There was something in the place that could only be seen through prayerful eyes. The three hundred children lived in cottages, each cottage under an Indian girl with about a dozen tiny children in her charge. "How much do you pay these young women who care for all these children?" I asked. The lady replied, "It is very expensive work, for they have to be up at all hours of the day and night. It is too expensive to pay for, so none of us get a salary; we all do it through love." And love had begot love, for one could feel it in the very atmosphere. And

love in turn brought forth joy. I have never seen such joy on the faces of people. They shone. There was more joy here to the square inch than there was to the square mile outside. Here I felt that Jesus was at home and naturalised. You could feel His gracious presence everywhere.

'As we walked out of the place in reverent silence, my professor friend broke it by saying, "The Kingdom of Heaven is like unto Dohnavur."' [1]

Not that far.

'In many ways we are not unlike the Brahman who attended an evangelistic meeting where the Christians were glowingly telling how Christ had saved them. He felt he could stop it, so he got up and said, "You people say you are saved. So am I. As Christ has saved you, so Krishna has saved me." The missionary in charge of the meeting was wise, so he said, "I am very glad to hear that you are saved—very glad indeed. Now we are going down to the outcaste quarters and are going to see what we can do for these poor people. We will sit on their beds and in their houses and will share their lives to help them. Will you join us?" The Brahman thought a moment and then said, "Well, sahib, I am saved, but I am not saved that far." Some of our Christianity, like the Brahman, is individually saved, but it is not saved as far as the mind of Christ. It goes only part way. It is not socially applicable.' [2]

The Note of Experience.

'Some of us feel that experience does not matter as long as we have "the form of sound words." We are very like the Sikh driver of a missionary's car in North India. He became very interested in the missionary's preaching in the villages, and suggested that he be allowed to preach. The missionary was surprised, and asked, "But what will you preach about?" "Oh," said the Sikh, "I will preach against liquor and tobacco." "But," said the missionary, "you use both." "Yes," he promptly replied, "but, sahib, they don't know that." But don't they? We are all much better known than we think we are.'

[1] E. Stanley Jones, *Christ at the Round Table*, 105.
[2] *Ibid.* 95.

'The leader in the anti-Christian movement in China at the present time, the man who is the brains back of it all, told us that he had decided to become a Christian one night while studying in America. He went to hear a minister speak, found shallowness, turned away from it, and became as hard as steel. Our appeals fell upon a flinty soul. China is now in the throes of his anti-Christian movement. A shallow minister shakes China with anti-Christianity!' [3]

J. S. Hoyland.

THE WAY OF THE CROSS

In the hurry of work
When my mind is distraught and fevered,
When each duty that needs to be done,
Each person claiming my service,
Seems an insupportable burden:

Then, ah then, His quiet and comforting strength
is around me:

He knoweth my need,
In Christ He hath borne it, this burden, Himself,
The pressing importunate crowds,
The body that fails to answer the spirit's call,
The confusion, the haste,
The staleness of soul,
The weariness, day after day more acute:

He knows,
He has suffered it all,
He has trodden this way, has my Master:

And now will I greatly rejoice
That He calls me to tread it with Him,
For this is the way of the Cross.[4]

[3] *Ibid.* 131.
[4] J. S. Hoyland, *God in the Commonplace*, 67.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It is unfortunate that many excellent books by continental scholars, and not a few of even first-rate importance, remain inaccessible to English readers who know no language but their own. While it is true, as one may gratefully acknowledge, that some of the epoch-making work of very distinguished scholars, such as Wellhausen and Harnack, has appeared in English dress, it is equally true that work, scarcely less important, both of these and other scholars, has never been translated. Duhm's 'Theology of the Prophets' and Gressmann's influential work on eschatology remain unknown to students ignorant of German, as also all of Sellin's numerous and stimulating contributions to Old Testament science except his Introduction—so well translated by Mr. W. Montgomery—for which we have Professor Peake to thank.

But it is peculiarly unfortunate that Gunkel has remained so long unknown to the English-speaking public. For not only is he a great scholar who has made substantial contributions to Biblical science, but he has done brilliant work of a more popular kind, notably his little book entitled 'Selected Psalms'; and even his scientific work is invested with such literary grace that it could hardly fail to interest and even to fascinate the educated layman who had any interest at all in Biblical science. It is happily possible for English readers to taste Gunkel's quality in his 'Legends of Genesis,' but it is profoundly to be regretted that his great commentary on Genesis has never been made accessible to them in an English translation—surely one of the most charming commentaries ever written on any book, and unquestionably our most brilliant commentary on Genesis.

We welcome, therefore, all the more eagerly the volume entitled *What Remains of the Old Testament* (Allen & Unwin; 6s. net), which has been so skilfully translated by the Rev. A. K. Dallas, M.A., that at no point are we reminded that we are reading a translation. The book contains five essays, happily chosen to illustrate the range and variety of Gunkel's interests. Two of these are technical, one on 'Jacob,' which illustrates the scientific treatment of Genesis, the other on 'The Close of Micah,' which illustrates the literary and other problems lying behind prophecy. These essays will appeal more particularly to scholars.

The other three essays display Gunkel's power of appealing to a wider public. One of them deals with 'The Fundamental Problems of Hebrew Literary History,' and discusses the origin and development of Old Testament literary types—a field in which Gunkel has done pioneer work. In another, on 'The Religion of the Psalms,' he applies this idea of types to the Psalter, whose songs he classifies as Hymns, Songs of Praise, National Dirges, Court Songs, Individual Dirges, and Individual Songs of Praise, and he discusses the various aspects of religion exemplified by these types. This essay is refreshingly different from the

ordinary introductions to the Psalter and is replete with fruitful suggestion. But the longest and, in form, most popular essay of all is that on 'What is Left of the Old Testament,' which gives its title to the volume.

It is a pity that at this time of day such an essay needs to be written at all; for, as Sir George Adam Smith said long ago, the Book which was indispensable to the Redeemer must continue to be indispensable to the redeemed. But at intervals, from the second century to our own, the Old Testament has been the subject of more or less virulent attack. There are those in our schools and even Churches who contend that, as Christians, we can have nothing to learn from a literature which Christianity has transcended, and there are some who would even be glad to see the study of Hebrew and Hebrew literature disappear from the theological curriculum of students preparing for the ministry of the Church.

No one, of course, could cherish such desires or advocate such proposals who has any idea of the living continuity of history, or who realizes how essentially unintelligible much of the New Testament literature would be, if divorced from its historical antecedents. But we have to reckon with an atmosphere in which ignorance of the Old Testament even as literature and indifference to historical continuity prevail; and it is in view of this atmosphere that Gunkel offers his fine defence of the Old Testament, and especially in view of the needs of the elementary school teachers of Germany who 'received in the Training Colleges an obsolete conception of the Bible.' Though this is certainly not the conception of the Bible taught in the Teachers' Training Colleges of Scotland, it is a conception even yet so widely prevalent in Britain that Gunkel's words are not without their application here.

He frankly admits, of course, the weaknesses of the Old Testament; its science is not our science, nor are its morals always our morals. Jacob's trickery is not the less trickery that it is Jacob's, 'a roguish piece of folk-lore,' and the desire for vengeance that breathes through the last lines of Ps 137 is none the less terrible that it is historically intelligible. But there is more in the Old Testament than things like these; and part of our difficulty in recognizing those other things is just that they have sunk so deeply into the mind of the world that we do not realize that they are the result of original thinking and of long and heroic struggle.

Take, for example, what Gunkel calls 'the imperishable power of the Moral Idea.' In our modern minds religion and morality are indissolubly associated. The Hebrew prophets answered once and for all the question 'Wherein consists the true service of God?' and they answered it in ethical terms. But in this 'the prophets achieved a fundamentally new conception of religion.' With trenchant power they hammered into the hearts of their people, and, through their writings, into the heart of all mankind, the truth that the essence of sin among men is oppression of the lowly, and that righteousness consists in worthy treatment of the poor and the oppressed — a thought which has affected to the very roots all modern social legislation.

There are even aspects of religion in which the Old Testament is not only a valuable but an indispensable supplement to the New. Of the presence of God in Nature the New Testament has very little to say: there is practically nothing in it to correspond to the great Nature Psalms, the eighth, the twenty-ninth, above all, the glorious hundred and fourth. Again, there is little in the New Testament to match the overwhelming interest that the religion of the Old Testament takes in political affairs. And as the corollary of this is the great conception of world-history that permeates most of the prophetic literature and that receives its most systematic presentation in the Book of Daniel. All this is of direct value for our modern world and our modern conception of religion.

The very 'creedlessness,' as it has been called, of the Old Testament is also not without its value. Doubtless this indifference to systematic thinking is, as Gunkel admits, one of the weaknesses of the Hebrew mind; yet its lack of interest in dogma, its

sheer incapacity to deal with or even to imagine the theological subtleties which are just beginning to be apparent in the New Testament, and in which the first four Christian centuries fairly revelled, is a healthy reminder of the limitations of reason and of the importance of seeing things in their true perspective. 'To see this sheer simplicity is good for us, a generation whose spiritual world has come to be as complex as our social conditions.'

Most of us do not adequately realize the finite obligation of the modern world to the Hebrew people and to the Old Testament. We should be prouder of our heritage if we understood it better. Two quotations from thoroughly unprejudiced witnesses illustrate this point. One is from Nietzsche: 'In the Old Testament of the Jews, the book of Divine righteousness, there are men, events, and words so great that there is nothing in Greek or Indian literature to compare with it.' The other is from the great historian of antiquity, Eduard Meyer, who says, 'Hebrew civilization, alone of all the other ancient Eastern civilizations, really stands on the same intellectual level as the Greek.' And Gunkel himself does not overstate the case when he describes the spiritual life of Israel as one of the foundations of the civilization of the Christian nations of Europe. 'Our civilization rests on two bases—the Bible and the civilization of Greece. We have become what we are in virtue of the combination of these two worlds. It would be a revolution, which no one living could estimate, if either of these foundations were to be moved.'

Not the least valuable feature of the Old Testament is its rich and varied gallery of personalities. Our own age is one in which personality tends to be swamped by the uniformity of the influences to which we are all alike subjected, crushed by the mighty machine which reduced us all to the same pattern. In the Hebrew world, unlike the Egyptian and the Babylonian world which was under the domination of despots and priests, personality had and took the opportunity of coming to its own; and 'the Old Testament, in its rugged strength, would be an iron in the blood for our time.'

Even on the score of its literary excellence, the Old Testament furnishes the teacher with an abundance of incomparable material; for where in the literature of the world are narratives that are inspired by a more winning simplicity or by more vivid and graphic power? But to meet the problems that suggest themselves to the growing minds of his older pupils, the teacher must train himself not only to the æsthetic and moral appreciation of the Old Testament, but to an understanding of the critical approach to it, and of the broad lines and results of the critical method.

With equal justice may this demand be made upon the preacher. We are in cordial agreement with Gunkel when he says that 'there should be more teaching on the part of the clergy than has been the case up till now.' A worshipping congregation never fails to respond to expository preaching when it is well done. Many of our best expositions, such as Dods' 'Genesis,' Sir George Adam Smith's 'Isaiah' and 'Minor Prophets,' Professor W. G. Jordan's 'Ancient Hebrew Stories and their Modern Interpretation,' were delivered to congregations in substantially the form in which they are printed. Thus may scholarship tend 'unto edification' not only of the mind, but of the spirit.

A note on the components of the phrase, 'Our Lord Jesus Christ,' may be useful in view of certain current discussions, in particular as to the origin and significance of the title 'Lord.' *Jesus* is the personal name of the human individual; and it is unnecessary to recognize more than a peculiar fitness in the fact that in Hebrew *Jesus* means 'Saviour,' because Jesus was quite a common name among the Jews when the Founder of our religion bore it.

The idea of Saviour is more properly conveyed by the name *Christ*, the Greek translation in the LXX of the Hebrew name Messiah, 'anointed.' But the name Christ lost in time its Hebrew connotation, no longer suggesting to the Greek mind the scion of the house of David who was to restore the fortune

of Israel, or the Son of Man from heaven who was to judge the living and the dead. Indeed, Christ came to be regarded as virtually an equivalent for Jesus.

As for the term *Lord*, the third component of the phrase under consideration, it is a term which is under investigation in our time, Bousset having opened up in his *Kyrios Christos* (1913) the whole problem of its meaning. But it was known, long before Bousset wrote the book above-named, that the term 'Lord' was used in the Græco-Roman religions of St. Paul's day with an absolute religious significance. It was a Divine predicate intelligible to the whole Eastern world.

Was the term 'Lord' applied to Jesus by His disciples and followers? If it was not applied to Him in His lifetime, it was after His death, as witness the saying, 'maranatha' (1 Co 16^{22}). And as soon as 'mari' or 'maran' was translated into Greek by κύριος it took on the connotation of κύριος among Hellenistic Jews and Gentiles, signifying the object of their religious faith. Thus as the distinction between Jesus and Christ, while never actually lost sight of, gradually became obliterated in the usage of the Christian Church, the Greek title 'Lord' became invested with the essential meaning of the Hebrew term 'Messiah' or Christ.

Here is how Deissmann puts it in his *Light from the Ancient East* (the publication of a new and revised edition of this work is noticed in another column): 'St. Paul's confession of "Our Lord Jesus Christ" was his cosmopolitan expansion of a local Aramaic cult-title, *Marana*, applied to Jesus the Messiah by the apostolic Primitive Christians at Jerusalem, and occasionally even by Paul himself in the outer world. Like the complemental thought, that the worshippers are the "slaves" of the Lord, it was understood in its full meaning by everybody in the Hellenistic East, and it facilitated the spread of the Christian terms of worship and of the cult of Christ itself.'

There will always be two minds about mysticism, one profoundly appreciative, the other intensely critical. Some it will irresistibly attract, others it will repel. To some it is the kingly highway to ultimate reality, to others it is a deceitful path leading to an obscure and vacant wilderness. When Wordsworth says:

> One impulse from a vernal wood
> May teach you more of man,
> Of moral evil and of good,
> Than all the sages can;

John Morley retorts, 'Such a proposition cannot be seriously taken as more than a half-playful sally for the benefit of some too bookish friend. No impulse from a vernal wood can teach us anything at all of moral evil and of good.' There you have two contrasted types of mind, the one logical and matter-of-fact, the other intuitive and mystical. The one is resolved to set everything in the clear light of reason, nor ever to stray beyond the realm within which ideas can be defined and classified, believing that here is for us the one circle of light within which we may safely walk. The other is sensitive to impressions that float in vaguely upon the soul from the dim unknown, feels that somewhere in that encircling gloom lies the true centre of things, and is eager to get away from the region where all can be seen and charted to explore the darkness wherein can be felt the mighty pulsations of the universal heart. Professor Otto has familiarized the world with the numinous, that dread mystery of the Divine which lies beyond our rationalizing, and he has applied to it the epithet '*fascinans*.' The mystic may be defined as one who has an overpowering sense of the *Mysterium Tremendum* and yields himself up to the fascination of it. The non-mystical mind keeps the reins tight in the hands of Reason and desires in all things to be under her control.

These diverse attitudes are illustrated in two papers which appear in the *Hibbert Journal* for April. The first is by Mr. Edmond Holmes on 'The Mystic as Explorer.' 'The mystics are the pioneers, the leaders of mankind, in a great adventure, in the quest of God, in the exploration of the

unmapped realms of Reality.' Reality is to be distinguished from actuality. Actuality admits of no degrees: a thing either is, or is not. But when we speak of 'ultimate reality,' 'supreme reality,' 'innermost reality,' we imply gradations or differences of value. By what standard are these differences measured? 'To this question there is but one answer: An inward standard, a standard which is inherent in self-hood. It is in self, it is in and through our consciousness of self, that we recognize gradation in reality. The distinction between the higher and lower self is a valid distinction, and the difference is a difference in the grade or level of reality.' It is in self, therefore, that the quest of ultimate reality is to be carried on. 'The mystic's quest for God resolves itself into the quest of ultimate reality; and this resolves itself into the quest of the real self.' What does the mystic find in the deepest depths of the self? He cannot tell us. His conviction of the transcendent reality of his experience is equalled only by his feeling of impotence when he tries to describe it. He may be the adherent of some religion or school of philosophy; in any case he has to use the language of symbolism. But all that is on the surface. '*The true mystics are all Pantheists at heart.* They know with an assurance which is beyond all conviction that All is One. They know this through their own oneness with the All, in whom all things are One.'

What is pantheism? The word has two parts: *pan* means all, and *theos* means God. The pantheist is one who deifies the All of Being. In other words, he is one who identifies ultimate reality with the All as a living whole, with the totality of things in their indivisible unity, with the One in the Many, the One to whom the Many owe whatever reality they possess. Why does this conception of reality excite such fierce opposition? Because it says No to some of the most cherished and deep-rooted convictions of the average man. The average man takes for granted the intrinsic reality of his own individual self, and the intrinsic reality of the material world which he looks out upon. No one who has not freed himself from the spell of these two great illusions can even begin to understand what pantheism really means. And the reason why the way to pantheism lies open to the mystics is that they have freed themselves from that spell, not indeed on the plane of intellectual thought, but on the higher plane of inward and spiritual experience.

'The message of the mystic to his fellow-men is that the light of love is at the heart of the world, at the heart of man's own real self, at the heart of all the space and all the ages. For this assurance we owe him an incalculable debt. How can we best repay it? By trying to walk where he has walked. By making him, at however great a distance we may follow him, our leader and our guide. But is he a trustworthy guide? What proof can he give that he has indeed lost and found himself in the light of love? This, that he does ardently desire to help us, that his heart is full of pity for his fellow-men.'

The second paper is by Professor OMAN and is a more critical study of mysticism. 'Mysticism is a phenomenon which always appears in times of political disillusionment and intellectual discouragement.' Its special marks are the process of banishing all ideas of sense from the mind, the reflection of some sort of unificatory theology, and, as its highest aims, ecstatic union with the Divine and passive reception of revelation. The question is whether there is a direct revelation of God which is not through experience of the world. The presupposition of mysticism is that experience is not a manifestation, but a veil which for moments waves aside and gives glimpses of reality. In Shelley's words:

> Life, like a dome of many coloured glass,
> Stains the white radiance of eternity.

Accordingly mysticism begins with the demand to dismiss from the mind all imagery derived from the senses, and with it all the divisive ways of the discursive reason. But by this path nothing is reached except a sort of luminous vacancy. 'Pure mysticism,' as Edward Caird says, 'arrives at unity with empty hands.' There is no genuine increase of knowledge; the mystic merely sees in vision what he already believes. 'Many have assayed to write what was so given them. But it has all been pious

platitude, of the dullest type of conformity to orthodox patterns; while in every religion any writing ever cherished as a sacred book has been written by men who were facing life and the conflicts of experience, and that with the highest activities of all their powers of mind.' This is further confirmed by the certainty that in ordinary experience there is no such thing as passive awareness and apprehension.

How does mysticism stand in relation to Christianity? 'The fact is that there is no such thing in the strict sense as a Christian mystic. In so far as an external revelation, the Church, religious service and duties to fellow-mortals are essential parts of religion, mysticism is absent, at least the mysticism here meant, the essential aspect of which is that experience is not a revelation of God, but a cloud obscuring his glory, and that we must exclude all concern with it to win direct vision.' It may be that when men lose themselves in a distracting age and in the dissipation of multifarious interests, such excursions from an active life as have been made by some Christian mystics may serve at least a temporary purpose of recollection. But the attitude of mysticism is full of moral danger. 'The contemplative who sets before himself the aim of reaching a state of vision from which he returns exhausted to practical life, there to recover vigour for a longer flight, is surely on the wrong track. . . . This is a shirking of the task of life, and not the real fulfilment of religion, which is, in freedom and independent thinking, to find our true relation to the past and to society and to the whole task of the Kingdom of God. This is a weary road, and mysticism is the most attractive of all caravanserais to linger in by the way. But, if we rest in it for the night, which for most of us at least is not for our real refreshment, we need to be up and facing all that life provides for us of venture early in the morning.'

The Sermon on the Mount.

The New Righteousness (Mt. v. 17–48).

By the Reverend A. J. Gossip, M.A., Aberdeen.

What are we to make of these arresting sayings? People who ignore Christ as an idle dreamer of still idler dreams can irritably push them aside as on the face of them impossible, and not worth considering. For life, so they object, cannot be lived in that quixotic fashion, flinging oneself at windmills, and tilting at the whole set of the world. And so they fold their hands and settle down complacently in the conventional ways, as if these were as inevitable as the laws of Nature. But that won't do for men and women who profess to take Christ seriously, and to have made His mind their guiding star. For us to skip all this, and turn to something soothing and heartening like the prodigal or some of the rich promises, conveniently forgetting this uncomfortable and upsetting teaching, is deliberately to disobey One whom we call the very Word of God: to look Him in the eyes and tell Him that He knows nothing about life; to set our jaws squarely and doggedly and answer, 'I will not.'

Yet what are we to do? Here are we set down to live in this very difficult kind of a world; and here too, obstinately, are these sayings of Christ which don't seem to fit into it at all, that look flatly impracticable, so that quite early glosses were slipped into the later manuscripts to break the force of the wind. 'Whosoever is angry,' said Christ; 'without a cause,' inserted a soul unable to keep up with Him. And indeed they are thrown down in the most arresting way without any qualifications, even such as our Lord Himself practised in the living of His own life; and sometimes with such a noisy clashing of part against part that it is not easy to piece the whole into a consistency within our dull and prosy minds, which in their pedantic fashion ask for little invariable rules and a full code of minute by-laws, and are given instead, much to their discomfiture, mighty principles which we are left to apply for ourselves; and tha through the exercise, not only of loyalty and faith

fulness, but of common sense and courage and a sense of proportion and even of humour. Newman went over to the Church of Rome largely because it told him definitely what to believe and what to do, took the ordering of things away from him and so saved him from the turmoil of uncertainty in his own mind, and the bother and the danger of decision. But resolutely Christ insists on treating us, not as babes in leading-strings, but as grown men and women. Here is the mind of God, He says, here also is your life; and, with the help of God and all the aids He has contrived for you, you must take that first and work it out into the stuff and pattern of this other with your own hands.

And the difficulty with which the Sermon on the Mount confronts us is just this, that nowhere is the immense originality of our Lord's bewildering mind more visible and staggering. For thousands of years we have been climbing towards Him, been peering up at Him, been teasing and fingering at the edges of His teaching. And yet His is still so lonely a soul that, when even now He says these things to us, we look up at Him puzzled and dumbfoundered and not at all certain whether He is serious or not. He is. And our plain business as Christian people is twofold. We must with care avoid a wooden literalness, that might easily enough miss the whole spirit of what He lays upon us. That first, that very certainly. Surely, for instance, there is a very obvious distinction between wild asseverations in our common speech and an oath in the law courts, which last our Lord Himself once took. That practice enjoined upon us there may not be flattering to our veracity, may openly hint doubts which we may find insulting. Yet surely looking to the fact that the Law deals with weighty and momentous issues, that life itself may be at stake, it is bound to take all possible precautions to ensure that it is founding, not upon fictions or mere suppositions, but on facts and truth; there too, no doubt, that precaution 'comes of evil' in the sense that it has been made necessary by human depravity, and in an ideal world would cease to be required. But, as things are, what can we do? Yet if a stodgy and unimaginative literalness is to be avoided, even more must we see to it that we are not simply leaving these disquieting laws of Christ upon one side, but are really endeavouring to work them into the practical living of our lives. It won't do to say, as a Prime Minister did not long ago, that obviously the State cannot be run upon the lines of the Sermon on the Mount. If we are not prepared to follow, both as a nation and as individuals, what we admit to be Christ's teaching, then why call ourselves Christians at all? 'Have you taken the name of Christ,' asked Leighton long ago, 'on purpose to dishonour it?'

This at least is clear that in these sayings we have a picture of the humanity of the future. For if anything is certain it is this—that any real advance that is to be will be along the lines of Jesus Christ. It is amazing how already He has moved to the centre of things, has Himself become the centre of things. For consider the astonishing facts! Here is One who was hustled to His death as a bad man, as One whose character and teaching were polluting the people's minds and morals, so that the authorities felt they must at all costs take the most drastic action. Yet now if anybody asks, 'But what is goodness?' the inevitable answer is, and must be, Look at Jesus Christ. Even in non-Christian India the highest adjective of admiration is Christlike. He was condemned as a blasphemer. People clapped quick horrified hands to outraged ears at the dreadfulness of His views of God. It was just shocking, so they said with unanimity. Yet now the one thing certain is that, if there be a God at all, He is Christ's God, and is Himself like Jesus Christ. As a distinguished Anglican divine has put it, 'To-day people are not worrying about the deity of Christ, but they are immensely interested in the Christlikeness of God.' In His own day His practice and teaching as to the Sabbath, the Scriptures, the grace of God, a score of things, seemed horribly immoral. But now we are learning that they are the only possible truths, have found that to be right we must follow with exactness in Christ's steps. So far we have slowly penetrated into His originality. But there are still infinite deeps in it we have not yet begun to sound, as these sayings now before us, and the shock they give us, prove. Yet these too are true: and one day others will look back at us, counting us hardly Christian in any full sense at all, wondering how we could have missed or been stumbled by elements of the Master's will which by their day will have become accepted as the only possibility, and the obvious way of things.

The fact is there have been two main forks in the tree of life. The one was when the animal and vegetable kingdoms separated. The latter had an easier and prettier road to much quicker results. And very glorious these are—the stateliness of trees, the greenness of grass, the loveliness of flowers. But along that line progress was arrested and came to a halt. The other took a road that

looks uglier and more squalid, through carnage and competition and blood. But it has climbed far higher to the grace of self-sacrifice and all the glories of humanity. The second all-decisive fork is Christ or not Christ. Turn your back on Him, and you may and will reach many wonderful things. Comfort and mechanical efficiency and a hugely interesting world—all this and much more are still open to you. But if you want to climb as high as soul, you must take Christ's way and follow Him. The road is steeper, the toil is harder, but the results are far more glorious. And if we refuse what we know to be Christ's will, we are taking the downhill path to degeneracy and decay and death; or at the least to an arresting of all higher progress. The man depicted in the Sermon on the Mount is the man of the future.

There are those, no doubt, who deny this; maintaining that this teaching is not of the future, but is flyblown and antiquated and out of date, carried to our modern bustling world like a dying echo from a primitive day when life was immeasurably more simple than it is now; and the complexity of our society and the intricacy of our problems had not risen on men's minds. This, they argue in effect, is legislation that might work in some small family clan, but nowadays the thing is utterly and hopelessly impossible.

For myself I resent that bland assumption that would dismiss Christ a little superciliously as One who came out of a small time, and whose mind and teaching are coloured by the smallness of His environment. Historically it has not a statable case. For the disconcerting fact is that nearly all our problems are more or less perennial. There were doles in Greece centuries before Christ, and war-time prohibition in China thousands of years ago, and leagues of nations often in quite early days. And Christ lived in a world which in essence was quite bewilderingly like our own, and among men and women whose hearts were strikingly akin to our hearts now. And our lofty attitude towards those old days and to the Master's teaching that came out of them is silly enough. Somehow the moderns who presume to talk down to Christ and to push Him aside as out of date, on the basis of their alleged fuller knowledge of life and the larger world in which we dwell, don't look bigger or cleverer or wiser than He; in short, they make themselves preposterously ridiculous, until one blushes hot for those who have no notion what clumsy, blundering, gawky souls they really are in Jesus' presence. If Christ followed the tradition upon any subject, then be sure that that was not merely tradition but the law of God. And if Christ, with deliberation and not hesitating to pay down the whole cost of His audacity, broke with the prevailing views, as on the sanctity of marriage, or with the unanimous prophetic custom, as on the drink question, and took a startlingly new and lonely road of His own, the Church resiles from that originality of His and goes back to the old ways He discredited, or to the prophetic views which He discarded, as to a quicker and truer and more thorough plan, at its own peril, aye, and at that of many generations. Take the instance given here, that of divorce. In our Lord's day that was granted easily on many grounds; any mere incompatibility of temper, or any roving of desire, was often held to be enough. But Christ daringly laid it down that only one reason was valid. And how much of decency and moral uplift the world owes to that. Yet nowadays a popular view is to talk disparagingly of His ruling as of a quaintly old-fashioned notion which the modern world has quite outgrown and definitely left behind. The United States considers itself a Christian nation, yet blatantly it pays little or no attention to Christ's mind upon this subject. What does it matter what He held? We know far better nowadays! And so with open eyes they have gone back to the very kind of thing from which He lifted us. It is easy fastening on vivid and distressing cases to build up a plea. Is a woman to be tied for life to a drunkard or a criminal or a lunatic? That is, indeed, a fearsome fate. And yet society must come before the individual. And where the sanctity of the marriage tie is loosened, civilization crumbles. 'For better or worse, for richer or poorer, in sickness or in health,' that is a covenant touched by the glow and splendour and chivalry of love. But to make a business contract which, if it does not pay us dividends in comfort big enough to please us, we immediately dissolve, that is not to pass ahead of Christ, but to slip far below the level that He set us. The full flowering time of His teaching in the world is not over and past; it lies still far ahead.

Yes, but it is not enough for us to look eagerly forward, and sing, 'It's coming yet for a' that,' with a thrill in our heart, and a huzza in our voice; and so, envying the happy people of the time to be, settle down meantime in our own ways as the one possibility for us as yet. We too must work these sayings here and now into our hearts and lives. And how?

What strikes me first about this new righteousness is the honouring claims Christ makes upon us.

That is what nowadays most thrills me in the Gospels. Not, as was once the case, the promises, but the demands, the glorious assumptions, the fact that looking at us He pitches things so high. What do ye more than others? He turns to us and asks. For He expects that Christian people will in any company move to the front by right: that as at the War men fell by natural selection and a kind of inescapable inevitableness into their fitting places, and he who could lead did lead, and he who could not fell in behind, as a matter of course, and followed, so Christian folk will by the nature of things prove themselves bigger and braver and wiser and more unselfish in the living of their lives than others. And that for two reasons. First, because they have an instinct that fastens on what matters and concentrates mainly on that, and sets lesser things into their due or secondary place. To-day many people boast with pride that they are so busy about carrying out the gospel in social reform that they have no time to be bothered with the mere rites of religion. And they say it not at all ashamed, but quite convinced that they are farther on than those who still waste time about the Churches and the like. And Christ looks at them. You are in the kingdom, He says, but just in it—'the least in it,' nothing more. And, on the other hand, there are those whose energy and thought are concentrated solely upon matters of ritual and so on, who are tremendously in earnest over these, quite staggeringly so indeed: shall we say upon early communion, and fasting and the like? And Christ declares with emphasis that if that is all they have to show they are not in the Kingdom at all. The righteousness I claim, He says, is something more than that. The real Christian, so He tells us, has a balance of mind that uses means as means, and ends as ends, and does not grow confused between the two, but puts each in its own fitting place. And further, he has something of his Master's eagerness to use his life with thoroughness and for the biggest things. Browning tells of a soul dragged forward like a conscript 'out of the glad, safe rear into the dreadful van.' But where there is sacrifice to be made, and danger to be faced, the Christian leaps forward, always volunteering, always first. So Christ expected. And yet is it so with us? Sacrifice! we say, drawing back, not liking the look of the dreadful van, preparing to slink into the safe, glad rear again. But, we stammer in confusion, I thought the whole point of this faith was that through it one gets off, that less will do, that in view of this grace of God toward us we need not worry as we used to do, nor mind nearly so much how we live, for He will get us through somehow. Isn't it so? I understood that the Cross means that the moral laws are in some way to swerve aside in our favour, that an exception in their working is to be made on our behalf, that a poor life with Christ will be accepted in place of a fine life without Christ. Well, it doesn't. Not so did they understand it in the New Testament. Rather they caught infection from their Master's chivalry. If Christ carried His cross, then so must I; if He gave His life, here is mine too. The faith is not an opiate but a spur, an inspiration, a compulsion to do more, far more than we had ever seen before to be our duty. The whole meaning of the thing is to create a world at last of spirits like Christ, flinging their lives away for God and others in His joyous and unreckoning way; and you and me among them. And if we don't wish that, then Christ is not for us.

And then there is the almost dreadful inwardness of this new righteousness. Law is a crude makeshift affair. It deals only with what is overt. Conduct, and what is written down, and words before credible witnesses, these are its sphere, but beyond that it cannot press into what a man is in the hush and hidden places of his own heart. But all the great religious teachers follow us into these remote fastnesses—past conduct and past words, and down into the secrecy of thought. 'Thought,' says a Buddhist, 'that mysterious essence of being.' And so indeed it is. It is difficult to credit that a solid piece of matter, a dour lump of a thing, is in reality no lump, but is composed of endless mobile electrons in perpetual motion. And all this busy life about us is built up of that airy insubstantial substance, always forming in these brains of ours, that we call thought as certainly as all the vivid pageantry of his dreams and the long procession of his characters were fashioned within Shakespeare's mind. And thus if one wishes really to change and cleanse the world, one must get back to thought, the final material out of which life is woven. That is why legislation, which deals only with outward things is, and must be, so inadequate; why politicians are at best mere fumbling amateurs; why in the last resort we must rely upon God's prophets who dig deeper, and push matters farther back, and strive to change, not our environment alone, but our innermost selves. For nothing less will serve. If a river runs foul and polluted through a city, it is nothing like enough to prevent the factories within its bounds from disgorging refuse into the waters. When that is done, the cure may prove to be no

cure, and the stinking yellow scum may still float past, breeding disease. You must get powers to start far farther back, and deal with the pollutions at the river's source. So here. Because, as Browning has it:

> I am ware it is the seed of act
> God holds appraising in His hollow palm,
> Not act grown great thence on the world below
> Leafage and branchage vulgar eyes admire.

And so our Lord, lighting a candle, takes us down into the dusty little-visited recesses of our hearts. Conduct, He says, that's little; let us probe much farther in. You have not murdered: are you sure of that? Look at your hands again! Is not that blood on them? If you have hated any one, or been angry with any one, that itself ranks as murder, as I judge. If you have been contemptuous to any even in thought, have sniffed at him, so the word seems to mean, there is no penalty that you do not wholly deserve. If looking down upon a man of lesser chance and smaller education you have said or thought, 'You stupid! Even the flaming of Gehenna were not too dreadful for a heart like yours!' So Christ says, and He means it; and He is to be our Judge. Truly if these be His standards for us, and if this is what He calls sin, if He should mark iniquity, who could stand!

And He passes deeper yet, past thought itself, and down into the imagination. Ezekiel has a terrible picture of certain old men, much respected in the city, leading clean and unchallengeable lives, who when the darkness fell, stole out into the night, and furtively slipt through the streets, and up into the Temple, locking its doors behind them, and so to a hidden postern let secretly into a wall, and through it, locking it too with care, and in that room where none might follow, and where even God's eyes they felt did not see, its walls all covered over with loathsome pictures and obscenities of hateful crawling filthy things, they carried through unspeakable orgies to unthinkable gods, and so watchfully crept forth, and back through the now silent streets, and out into their irreproachable lives again and the respect of decent unsuspecting men and women. What do you dream about? asks Christ. What do you picture when you are alone? And holding up that searching light of His, He flashes it upon the walls of our imagination to show—what? Is it reptiles and crawling things and horrors hidden away? Are we as true and pure there in that secret place, with never an eye to see, as out in the broad light of staring day? Your conduct may be blameless, and your words irreproachable, your very thoughts immaculate. But what of your imagination? Dare you face that test?

And yet so terrible is it to Christ that one should be smirched by evil even there, that He plunges into that terrific metaphor, surely the most heart-shuddering thing in Scripture, about the right hand cut off and the right eye torn out—anything, everything to be saved from this foul, festering pollution! Once on a day I had a ghastly experience. The 'phone rang early in the morning, and an hysterical woman's voice bade me come instantly. I went, and found that a most brilliant student had suddenly gone crazy in the night, had with a safety-razor blade cut off his hand, and lay there laughing exultantly. 'I did right,' he cried, 'I can look Jesus in the face.' They took him to the hospital, his hand beside him in a paper bag, and from thence to the asylum, poor crazed soul! But as I stood there in that blood-splashed place, Christ's hate and terror of sin even in thought came rushing in upon me. Pluck it out! Cut it off! Or it will fester, poison, slay your soul!

Lastly, this new righteousness is a positive and not simply a negative thing: is more by far than mere painful avoidance of evil; it is a glorying in doing right, and that according to a marvellous standard. Stevenson once sent a letter to his mother which he headed 'A Christmas Sermon,' denouncing the gloom of his father's religion, and underlining this conception that Christianity is much more than a not-doing this and a not-doing that. These negative commands, he wrote, have a 'black, angry look'; and, indeed, till one has actual 'pleasure in these difficult decisions,' things are not well with us; and after all the whole of essential morality is 'just kindness.' Well, Christ agrees with that. What we have to do, said He, is just to love. But when Stevenson imagined that that makes things greatly easier for us, in the deepest sense he is surely entirely wrong. Not easier, but harder; far, far harder. For look at what Christ means by loving. Take those tremendous sayings that have puzzled the world ever since they were uttered, and around which there is a constant din and never-settling dust of controversy about non-resistance and the like. They look as if they outlawed war: they look as if they ruled out law: they look as if they opened the door of opportunity for every impudent and importunate scamp to fatten on his fellows' kindness and credulity. And what are we to do with them? Are they meant to be vivid metaphors, like that about the hand and eye? Or are they

to be taken literally? Is the world, for example, waiting for a martyr nation, who will not resist when threatened by war, but go to its Cross, as Christ went to His, and so lift the earth to better things? Perhaps I have a barbarous soul that has been left behind by the rising tide of understanding of what the faith means. Yet there are wars conceivable to which, should they spring upon us, I for one would have to go again; or else not be able to look Christ in the eyes. And I believe in law as a Divine appointment that has changed this world from an uneasy scene of tyranny and insecurity into a safe and kindly place. And I will not give to some rogues whose life is a deliberate deception of better, aye, and sometimes poorer, people than themselves, and who by that are losing their own souls. But I will do my little part as a voter and as a Christian to prevent wars of aggression, and seek to stamp these altogether from God's earth: and I will pay my taxes uncomplainingly to help my less fortunate fellows, and try to be generous upon the Christian scale: and I will seek to be easy to live with, and not quarrelsome even about my undoubted rights, but forbearing and large-minded and kind. But easy! The truth is, says Christ, that what is wrong is that you are all using far too low a standard, with the result that you are much too quickly satisfied. It is not nearly enough to be just—though even that God knows is hard to practise; or to claim no more than your bare dues; or to pay your fellows their full rights, or to deal with men as they deserve. All that is far less than your bounden duty. When you use such things as your scale of measurement you are taking custom, or the conventions, or other people round about, or at the best the worthiest of them, as your index of how you ought to live and what you ought to be. And none of these will do. For your standard is God. For you to live deliberately on a lower moral plane than God is failure. And look yonder! There is an open sinner; yet you see the sunshine does not skip his fields! And there a scandalously immoral man; yet on his croft the rains fall just as healingly as upon any other. And you too in God's generous way must blot out enmity however well deserved as men judge things, must forget ingratitude, must meet rank unworthiness and worse with a queer stubborn love that keeps on obstinately loving in despite of everything. So only shall you prove yourselves the children of that Father who, whatever you have done, still unaccountably persists in loving you.

But who is sufficient for these things? Like some barbarian looking into Plato, aye, far more confusedly, so do I peer into the mind of Christ, as at a thing how far beyond and above me as yet. Only you remember Bunyan, how the evangelist asked, 'Do you see yonder wicket gate?' And the man answered, 'No, I don't.' 'Well, do you see that shining light,' he was next asked, and he replied, 'I think I do.' Keep that light in your eye, and you will reach the goal in time, so he was told. Let us, too, keep our eyes on Christ, and follow Him on to the end of all we see to be His will, as that will becomes ever fuller to us. And in us also it will all come true in time.

Latinity of the Pastorals.

By the Reverend F. R. Montgomery Hitchcock, D.D., Tolleshunt Knights, Maldon.

St. Paul moved with the times. He was keenly alive to every opportunity for founding a new community. And, if possible, he would carry out his plan, frustrated so long by Jewish cabals, of winning the vigorous people of Gaul and Spain to the faith. He must have seen that the great Latin peoples that had recently come into the empire were intensely proud of their new status, and would prove worthier converts than Oriental or Greek. The Apostle's style had been considerably changed by his two long imprisonments in Cæsarea and Rome. His powers had been curtailed, his vigour sapped. He was a prematurely aged man in his Roman lodging. His circumstances and inclinations and his bodily weakness made him briefer and more concise in his periods; and perhaps a little more egotistical, and at the same time more human. We cannot think that he was so engrossed in his controversies with Jews and Gentiles, and in the affairs of the Churches he had founded, that he had not some mental recreation. In the Argiletum, the next street to

where he lodged, he or his friends would purchase at the book-stalls copies of the Latin classics, the letters and orations of Cicero among them. For he knew if he was to work in Spain that he would have to speak Latin. Strabo, who wrote about A.D. 19, says of the Spaniards, 'the dwellers in the regions of the Baetis have been so thoroughly Romanised that they have actually forgotten their own tongue' (151). He would not have been slow to seize the opportunity of conversing in Latin with the well-trained and educated Prætorian who was always with him — a man of pure Italian birth, who despised everything Greek, language and people. It was the ambition of many an Italian youth to qualify for the Guards, in stature and education. The lessons they had learned from Horace and Virgil in their youth would be often on their lips. Suetonius relates that when Nero sought to induce some of the Guards to share his flight, one answered in the words of Virgil, 'Usque adeone mori miserum est?' (*Æn.* 12. 642) ('Is it so wretched a thing to die?'). He would hear them quoting snippets of Terence, Plautus, and Horace, and he would reset the quotations in his own Greek; and so we have 'Approve things that are excellent' (Ph 1^{10}) ('video meliora proboque,' Ovid, 7. 21); and 'Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honourable . . . think on these things' (Ph 4^{8}) ('quid verum atque decens curo et rogo et omnis in hoc sum,' Hor. *Ep.* i. 1. 11); where the expression 'if there be any *praise*' is meaningless in Greek, as ἔπαινος does not mean an act deserving praise, whereas the Latin *laus* does, 'merui qui *laude* coronam' (Virg. *Æn.* 5. 55).

This new experience in the Apostle's life helps to explain the difference in the style of the Pastorals from the Paulines generally. There is a great difference between the argumentative Romans and the philosophical Ephesians, but in the Pastorals we are dealing with a third style, equally different from both, and yet possessing many Pauline peculiarities. A change of amanuensis, unless such a person was given a very free hand, which would have been unlike Paul to grant, could not explain this difference. We must take into account his Latin studies, and the fact that he was hourly, for two years, in the company of an Italian who would not speak Greek, and with whom he would have to converse in Latin. The letter about Phœbe (Ro 16) marks the transition to the new style, which we may call the Pastoral, and which was better adapted to his present work of consolidation than the oratorical. In the formation of this style he was assisted by Latin terms and phrases, which helped him to give more precise formulæ of doctrine, and more exact specification of the ethical and spiritual qualifications for the various offices and employments in the ministry, and also to express his *indignatio saeva* in mordant and masterly passages which recall the annihilating tongue of Cicero. In the Pastorals we have a preciseness, a clear-cut finish in theological statements and summaries. In the Paulines the thoughts are too great at times for expression. He cannot formulate them with exactness. The thought is struggling with its medium. But here great theological statements are presented with a sharp edge, a finished form or ὑποτύπωσις (2 Ti 1^{13}). These statements are not to be expanded or paraphrased, but to be committed to memory. Here we note the effect of the Latin in its lucidity as well as in its authority. Latin is the language of conquerors as well as of orators. It is strong in commands. There are thirty imperatives in 2 Ti. The passages that show most difference in style from the Paulines reveal the influence of Latin in their short, curtailed, and also cumulative sentences. And if we want literary parallels to the Pastorals we have to seek them in Latin. Compare with their condensed summaries and imperatives and statements of qualifications for the various offices the condensed summary of the *law* of the state magistrates in Cicero's *De Legibus*, iii. 3–5. It contains ninety-nine lines (Titus has ninety-two), and is an introduction to, and explanation of, the various state offices, ædiles (like the deacons, 'ad honoris amplioris *gradum* is primus ascensus'; cf. 1 Ti 3^{13} —deacons secure a good *step* (βαθμός) for themselves), prætors, consuls, etc., defining their *potestas* and *imperium*. It abounds in imperatives. We have also the *commentarium isagogicum*, or introductory treatise which Varro wrote for Pompeius in 69 B.C., the *commentariolum petitionis*, or instructions about his canvass for the consulship which Quintus thought fit to send his brother, the great Tullius, in 64 B.C., and the letter which Tullius wrote to Quintus (Q. *Fr.* 1. 1) in 60 B.C., about his duties as proprætor of Asia. This is a masterly document on the duties and conduct of a Roman governor of a province, which might be entitled 'How one ought to behave in a Province,' just as the letters to Titus and Timothy might have the headline, 'How one should behave in the Church of God' (1 Ti 3^{15}). Similar points are stressed in both documents. The letter to Quintus was intended to brace him up for his work, so that he should not be dejected by the extension of the period of his office to three years, but should rouse

himself up to master his duties (4); cf. 1 Ti 1^3, 'As I exhorted you to stay on (in spite of difficulties) in Ephesus.' The Second Epistle is an exhortation from beginning to end. Cicero says his letter has become a formal lecture, 'ad *praecipiendi* rationem delapsa oratio.' Each of the three Pastorals might be called a 'præcipiendi ratio' or formal lecture. Cicero had given his brother the hope of an early retirement from Ephesus (1). St. Paul had evidently encouraged Timothy with the same idea. Now both writers entreat their friends to stay on in Ephesus and to do their best, one for the State, the other for the Church. 'You are in a place,' wrote Cicero, 'where everything depends on your own virtue and wise rule' (5). The same thought runs through the Pastorals. Cicero refers to the 'grave *controversies* and great *contentions*' among the provincials (ii. 7). Paul also spoke of '*controversies* (λογομαχίαι) from which arise contentions' (διαπαρατριβαί) (1 Ti 6^4). In *de Leg.* 1. 20, Cicero spoke of the 'verborum controversiae' among philosophers.

Both writers condemn the love of money. Cicero warns his brother against people who do everything *pecuniae causa* (v. 15); and not to allow his more sordid officials to make gain (*quaestus*) out of their offices. Paul warned Titus against those who teach false doctrines for the sake of sordid gain, αἰσχροῦ κέρδους χάριν (i. 11), and insists on his bishops and deacons being free from the same love of gain or money (Tit 1^{17}). Again, Cicero warned his brother against backbiters and hypocrites, and especially Greeks, 'false and trained to excessive flattery' (v. 16). Paul warns Timothy against the hypocrisy of false teachers (1 Ti 4^2), says he must not listen to charges against the presbyters, and that the deacons must not be 'double-tongued' (1 Ti 3^8). Speaking of Asia generally, Cicero says the things that are respectable, such as integrity, continence, self-respect (*pudor*), and the serious and regular discipline of the household 'familiae gravis et constans disciplina' (vi. 18) would seem almost Divine in such a corrupting province and amid such low moral surroundings. In 1 Ti $1^{9.10}$ Paul gave a long list of sins and wickednesses practised in that province and elsewhere. Cicero warns Quintus against entrusting things to men who were not above suspicion, and even to faithful slaves. 'Commit and entrust these things,' said Paul, 'to faithful men' (2 Ti 2^2). Cicero warns his brother against the insinuating manner of the Greeks. They worm themselves into your confidence. Their friendships are pushing, not reliable. They whisper into your ears for the sake of gain (vi. 16). Paul describes the false teachers who worm their way into families, and lead captive silly women (2 Ti 3^6); and also their dupes, whose ears are itching for news, and who heap teachers on themselves (2 Ti 4^3). On the other hand, Cicero urges his brother to rouse himself to win golden opinions from all sorts of people (14^{41}); and Paul says that it is necessary to be well spoken of by those who are without (1 Ti 3^7). And both insist on 'steady and serious household discipline,' for which Grecian Asia was not remarkable. Deacons are therefore to rule their children and their households well (1 Ti 3^{12}); and bishops are to do the same, 'for if one does not rule his own household well, how can he rule the Church of God?' (1 Ti 3^5). 'Control yourself,' said Cicero, 'and you will have no trouble in controlling those you rule' (ii. 7). 'Self-control' is one of the topics of the Pastorals. The bishop who rules must rule himself, ἐγκρατής (Tit 1^7). The word σώφρων implies continence. Cicero warned Quintus against carelessness in choosing or recommending friends. 'You must use circumspection, for you are not only responsible for your own conduct, but for all the ministers of your government' (iii. 10). Timothy is likewise not to ordain without caution, as he is responsible for them to the Church, and he might be involved in the sins of others (5^{22-25}). Paul urged Timothy to test the candidates before allowing them to become deacons (1 Ti 3^{10}). Cicero urged his brother to sift carefully the characters of his officials, as he was responsible not only for their deeds, but their words (4^1). 'Our ancestors did not recklessly (*temere*) give the office of "accensus" to any but their own freedmen' (iv. 13). 'Lay hands recklessly (ταχέως) on no man,' said Paul (1 Ti 5^{22}). Quintus is warned against favouritism and partiality. His court decisions are not to be influenced by favour (*gratia*; vii. 20). There must be consistency and dignity (*gravitas* = σεμνότης only in 1 Ti 2^2 3^4, Tit 2^7), which resists not only favour (*gratia*), but the suspicion of it. Timothy when dealing with the presbyters is ordered to act without prejudice and favour (πρόσκλισις) (1 Ti 5^{21}). Quintus must give no occasion to any one to talk or abuse him (*vituperatio*; vi. 17). Titus (2^7) is to 'show himself an example of good works, that the enemy may have nothing bad to say about us.' The fear of bringing scandal upon the cause is the greatest deterrent in both documents. 'Lest the word of God be basely injured' (blasphemed) (Tit 2^5), 'lest the name of God and the doctrine be injured' (do.) (1 Ti 6^1). Cicero says of Gratidius, 'I am sure he is just as anxious for our reputation as for his own'

(iii. 10). So there must not be the slightest breath of suspicion about a Church official. He must be 'sans peur et sans reproche' (ἀνέγκλητος, ἀνεπίλημπτος; 1 Ti 3^2 5^7; cf. v.[14]), lest the cause should suffer. Cicero commends to Quintus the example of Cyrus, who blended 'summa gravitas' with 'singularis comitas.' So Timothy is to instruct with πραότης (*comitas*, 2 Ti 2^{25}), and Titus is to show gravity, σεμνότης (Tit 2^7), in his instruction. Cicero censures his brother's *iracundia* and *acerbitas* (xiv. 40), and says his letters have made him 'patientior leniorque.' 'A bishop also must not have this wrathful disposition,' ὄργιλος (Tit 1^7). He must be ἐπιεικής (1 Ti 3^3), not πλήκτης (Tit 1^7) like the 'plagosus' Orbilius, who instructed young Horace. Cicero's advice to Quintus, 'to be temperate, to restrain all desires, to control one's people, to show oneself easy of access and ready to listen to argument,' might have served as a text for the Pastorals. He also urged Quintus to give all his attention to his work, '*incumbe* toto animo et omni studio' (ix. 27[1]); cf. 1 Ti $4^{15.\ 16}$, 'ponder these things, be wholly engaged in them,' ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι (cf. 'totus in illis'), 'attend to yourself and the teaching, continue in them.' Cicero appeals to the 'common faith which is owed to all men' ('communis fides quae omnibus debetur'), Paul to the common faith, κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν (Tit 1^4), possessed by all Christians. Cicero reminds Quintus of his studious youth and virtuous life (x. 29); as Paul reminds Timothy of his youthful studies (2 Ti 3^{14}). One says the governor must show hospitality and friendship (v. 16); the other says the bishop must be hospitable, φιλόξενος (1 Ti 3^2, Tit 1^8). These are striking parallels. In letters of similar import similar sayings would occur, but the similar mentality of these writers cannot be so explained. Both writers lay stress on the same principles of government, often in the very same phrases. Both consider the final cause of the Law. Cicero declares it to be 'the greatest happiness of the governed' (8. 24); St. Paul, 'love' (1 Ti 1^5). Says Cicero, 'If you were set over fierce and barbarous nations, it would be the object of your humanity to consult their interests and serve their welfare (*salus*), and give your whole attention to love them, protect them, and make them happy' (8. 23). The writer of the Pastorals writes as a cultivated Roman Christian. His ideas move in a distinctly Roman circle. His thoughts and aims are projected along the distinctly Roman lines of personal dignity, piety, obedience to superior officers, equity in judgment, moderation, integrity, self-control, discipline, organization, and faithfulness to one's trust. . . . The proprætor and his staff of officials and officers, his quæstor, legati, and all the ministers of the government, working together for the moral and material welfare (*salus*) of the provincials, and displaying a wise discretion and polished *humanitas*, might well serve as a prototype of the Christian bishop, and his entourage of presbyters, deacons, and others, all working for the spiritual well-being (*salus*) of the Christian community. The governor himself, easy to approach at all hours, 'in season and out of season' (2 Ti 4^2), not only in his courthouse, but even in his bedroom (*cubiculum*, 8. 3); listening to the troubles of his people, careful to avoid the least breath of scandal, and the slightest attempt at bribery, a sort of 'divine man' dropped down from heaven into the province (ii. 7), in whose eyes the safety, children, reputation, and property of his subjects are the dearest things on earth (iv. 13); discreet in his choice of friends, a wise and fair, grave, self-controlled, humane, stately, cultured gentleman, treating all with generosity and showing hospitality and friendship to those of worthy character—is an admirable picture of what a Church ruler should be. Governors like Ambrose of Milan, who fashioned their lives according to Cicero's sketch, proved the best bishops after the standard of the Pastorals.

The mentality of the writer of the Pastorals is Roman in the highest sense, according to the highest Roman traditions, such as the outlook of one would become who had realized through contact with pure Romans the superiority of their 'gravitas' and 'pietas' to the levity and insincerity of the Greeks, and the value of his own citizenship as a Roman in the greatest empire on earth.

There are some one hundred and sixty words and phrases in the Pastorals which are distinctly Latin. We can substitute *disciplina* (= discipulina) for διδασκαλία (sing.) in every passage, the former being used both of instruction and system. We have the Latin introduction to a proverb 'verum illud verbum,' in πίστος ὁ λόγος (the article is rarely found because the Latin has none). Δι' ἣν αἰτίαν, almost peculiar to the Pastorals in NT, frequently in Diodorus Siculus, the Latin-Greek writer, represents *quam ob rem* or *causam*; χάριν ἔχω is the Latin 'gratiam habeo,' also in Diodorus, etc. With Jesus 'our hope' (1 Ti 1^1) compare Scipio 'our every hope' ('spem omnem,' Livy, 28. 39). The τινες, of contempt, several times in Pastorals, is the Latin 'quidam,' used in same way (Terence, *Eun.* iii. 2. 20). 'In me the gods showed all their power' (Terence, *Eun.* v. 8. 3). 'In me Christ Jesus showed all patience' (1 Ti 1^{16}). πας all

through represents the Latin *summus* (Tit 2^{15}), 'rebuke with supreme (πάσης) authority'; cf. Cicero, *Att.* i. 17. 8, 'I rebuked the Senate *cum summâ auctoritate*.' 'Sinners of whom I am first' (πρῶτος) recalls 'princeps sceleris' (Cicero, Cluent). 'This is right and acceptable' (1 Ti 2^{3}) is the 'gratum acceptumque' of Cicero. Women *professing* godliness or religion (of 1 Ti 2^{10}) are in contrast to the 'professae,' the women whose calling was afterwards described by Tacitus as a 'professio flagitii' (*Ann.* ii. 85), and who were debarred from the καταστολή, or long robe. The writer even attempted to put Horace's 'non erubescendus' into Greek (2 Ti 2^{15}). It is the Latin that helps to explain 2 Ti 2^{15}, as driving a straight furrow in the field of truth, for the ploughman must not *praevaricate* (Pliny, 18. 19). The confusion between 'elder' (presbyter) of age and 'elder' (presbyter) of office in 1 Ti 5^{1} and 5^{17} is not in the Latin, which has 'senior' in the former and 'presbyteri' in the latter. The confusion between '*deacon*' of office in 1 Ti 3^{8} and διάκονος in the sense of servant of Christ (1 Ti 4^{6}) is not in the Latin, which here has 'minister' and there 'diaconi.' 'Their word will spread as a *gangrene*' (2 Ti 2^{17}), a metaphorical expression found in Varro (26 B.C.). 'Quippe qui,' seeing that, or inasmuch as, underlies ὅστις on the six occasions. The difficult passage (2 Ti 2^{20}), the firm *themelios* of God *standeth* having this seal, 'the Lord knoweth,' etc., where a 'foundation' which always 'lies' elsewhere here stands, may be explained as a boundary stone, a *terminus* or *cippus* which stood erect, and often bore an inscription (Horace, S. 2. 6. 38). See Ovid, *Fasti*, ii., where the stone itself is called 'Terminus,' dividing one field from another. Here there is a division made by the *themelios* between the Lord's people and those who are not. The Romans sealed letters and things. We have *membranae*, *paenula* (2 Ti 4^{11}), *aniles fabellae* (Hor.) in γραώδεις μῦθοι (1 Ti 4^{7}), *irrepere* of insidious entry in ἐνδύνοντες (2 Ti 3^{6}), and numerous other phrases in which a Latin word may lurk.

Furthermore, in the grand sonorous passages (2 Ti 3, 1 Ti 1^{5-20}) there is more of Cicero than Demosthenes. In the Pastorals and in the Orations of Cicero we have the same piling up of crimes, the same intensive accumulation of sinister attributes. In his lurid but vivid pictures of Catiline, Antony, Dolabella, and Verres, Cicero is unsurpassed. His mordant tongue eventually lost him his head. Antony would not forget. And yet the passage that most resembles *Philippic*, iii. 14, 'nostis insolentiam Antonii,' etc., is 2 Ti 3^{1-9}. Albeit more refined, it is an equally awful picture, and expressed in similar sonorous sesquipedalian words. We see the stealthy entrance of the false teachers, under the semblance of the religion whose reality they have forsworn, into the homes of women, women who have had a baneful past, but are struggling out into the light, just to be dragged back into hell and darkness. On the other hand, we are in the stately hall of Varro, a home of study, a treasury of art, and one of Antony's banquets is in progress; it is a scene of profligacy, abandonment, and temptation and 'madness,' the very word Paul used of the false teachers. By the side of the list of crimes, each with an awful picture behind it, in 1 Ti 1^{9}, we can place the descriptions of *Catiline*, ii. 4. The parallels are striking. For Nero, matricide, parricide, murderer, impurest and wickedest of men, and his boon companions, men of finish but of vice, were like Catiline and his crew, 'opposed to sound moral teaching.' On the other hand, we have charming pictures in Cicero of stately homes, great ladies of high reputation, delightful children, kind-hearted gentlemen like Lepidus (*Phil.* 13. 4), and a most virtuous discipline, 'sanctissima disciplina,' like that of Pompey (*Phil.* 2. 28). Such pictures may have suggested to Paul that the children of the clergy, inferior and higher, might be equally 'optatissimi,' their wives equally 'probatissimae,' and their home discipline equally 'sanctissima.' But it is in Cicero's letters that we find the most numerous and striking parallels to the Pastorals. A few may be mentioned here. Tiro, like Timothy, was delicate, both being κακοστόμαχος. As Paul prescribed wine for Timothy, Cicero prescribed it for Tiro. Paul had a weakness for Timothy. He was aware that he was criticised for appointing one so young. Cicero appointed Caelius his quæstor to take charge of Asia until the new consul arrived. 'Puerum, inquies, et fortasse fatuum et non gravem, et non continentem,' (*Att.* vi. 6), 'a foolish youth neither σεμνός nor σώφρων (cf. Tit 2^{2}), you will say. But the appointment suited my old age.' Paul 'the aged' would have made the same excuse. With Paul's friendship for the youthful Timothy, compare Cicero's affection for Marcus Marcellus (*Fam.* xv. 9), 'I hear that in all your sayings, actions, studies, and pursuits you are like me'; cf. 2 Ti 3^{10} ('omnibus dictis factis studiis, institutis'). Paul praised Timothy for following his instruction, way of life, purpose, faith, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, τῇ ἀγωγῇ. With Paul's interest in Timothy's improvement (1 Ti 4^{15}), cf. Cicero (*Fam.* xv. 16*a*), where, writing to his son, he says, 'I have just had a letter which shows that he is making progress' (same word προκοπή). We have

ten compounds with φιλο- in Pastorals, twenty-four in Cicero's letters, forty-nine compounds with ἀ- in Pastorals, sixty in Cicero's letters, and some of both are the same. We have snippets of quotations from Homer and others in Cicero's letters, as we have in Paul's writings. Paul requested Titus to show attention to Zenas and Apollos, and see that nothing was lacking that they required (Tit 3^{13}). Cicero (*Att.* xi. 3. 2) says of a parting guest, 'look after him and see that nothing is lacking that he requires.' Cicero had a penchant for 'conceit,' τῦφος, τετυφῶσθαι, etc. Paul used the verb three times in Pastorals only. Cicero says (*Att.* 16. 2. 6), 'You say that you will winter in Epirus,' and requests Atticus to come there. Paul says, 'Hasten to come to me at Nicopolis (in Epirus), for there I intend to winter' (Tit 3^{12}). With the double invitation, 'Hasten to come to me,' 'hasten to come to me before winter' (2 Ti $4^{9.\ 21}$), compare the reiterated invitations to Atticus (iii. 25), 'Try to be with me, wherever I am, before the kalends of July' (iii. 26). 'I pray you hasten to come to me' (iv. 1. 8), 'I am waiting for you, and I beg of you to hasten to come.' In the three following letters he repeats it.

As last century saw the rehabilitation of the correspondence of Cicero with Brutus attacked by Tunstall (1741), Markland, Niebuhr (1828), and many others, and defended by Hermann, Muller, Tyrrell, and Purser, this century may witness the rehabilitation of the Pastoral Epistles, whose authenticity has been as stoutly defended as vigorously assailed.

Literature.

THE WISDOM LITERATURE.

Professor C. F. Kent did not live to complete his great and finely conceived scheme of 'The Student's Old Testament, Logically and Chronologically Arranged and Translated,' of which five volumes have already appeared. Fortunately, however, the single volume on *Proverbs and Didactic Poems* (Hodder & Stoughton; 20s. net) necessary to complete the series existed in Professor Kent's manuscript to the extent of about two-thirds; and it has been very successfully completed by Dr. Millar Burrows, of Brown University, a pupil and friend of Professor Kent, who has caught not only his spirit but his method, so that the present volume is as nearly as may be what Dr. Kent would have wished it to be.

Besides dealing with Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Job, which are translated in full into vigorous modern English, it presents in the Introduction a general discussion of the Wisdom Literature with its Babylonian and, more particularly, Egyptian affiliations, and one chapter offers a fine appreciation, with apt illustrative quotations, of Ben Sira, who, however, is not translated. The Book of Proverbs is arranged, much as in Professor Kent's little volume on 'The Wise Men of Ancient Israel and their Proverbs,' published over thirty years ago, according to subject-matter, so that one can see at a glance its teaching on any of the topics discussed —a great convenience to the preacher and to the student of Israel's ethical thought. Ecclesiastes, which Kent believes to be influenced by the older Babylonian philosophy, presupposes a Greek atmosphere and is set in the years immediately following 200 B.C. Its unabashed pessimism, which is that of extreme old age, is attacked in interpolations which represent about a fourth of the present book. In the introductory discussion to Job a suggestive comparison is instituted between Job and the Babylonian King Tabi-utul-Bel, with whose story Job has many affinities if also many differences. The value of the Book of Job, as an appeal to the sorely harassed Jewish nation of the post-exilic period, is suggestively brought out. This 'lyric drama,' as the writer calls it, in which God, rather than Job, is on trial, is set about 450 B.C., and though the problem with which the book deals is kept within the limits of this earthly life, Dr. Kent believes that it 'reveals the birth-pangs of the belief in a personal immortality.' It is good that Professor Kent's monumental work, carried through for so many years with such unflagging industry, should have been brought to completion by the hands of a scholar so competent and sympathetic as Dr. Burrows.

MORALS IN REVIEW.

The aim of the treatise—*Morals in Review*, by Dr. A. K. Rogers (Macmillan; 15s. net)—is thus stated by the author: 'What I have set out to do

is not to reproduce everything that philosophers have said about ethics, but to isolate the more significant contributions which have left a definite mark, especially as these are still relevant to discussions at the present day.' Dr. Rogers is well qualified for a work of this kind, for he has already proved by his numerous books on philosophy and ethics his scholarship and his judgment in this field. It is a liberal education in the history of ethical speculation for the reader to follow him in his review from Socrates down through the centuries to Leslie Stephen and our own day. In such a wide field the difficulties of significant selection are very great, and perhaps no two thinkers equally conversant with the subject-matter would on all points and persons agree, but it is safe to say that in this volume the really significant thinkers are handled, and their merits and defects judiciously considered in the light of their age.

There is such a calm air of sanity pervading the volume and such an obvious desire for impartiality of treatment that it may appear monotonous to the reader, until he remembers that the questions of morality here dealt with are of such importance that any cheap excursions after sensational novelty are out of place. The writer is not here a moral reformer or ethical preacher, but a judicial historian, and he maintains this rôle throughout. This may to some make the book less interesting and picturesque, but it is therefore not the less important. The only chapter that may arouse mild astonishment is that on Mandeville, the once notorious author of 'The Fable of the Bees' (1670–1733). Dr. Rogers is conscious of the need of some justification for giving a whole chapter to this writer, and he calls it 'Moral Realism—a Digression,' but the reader has no cause of complaint, though he may still have doubts if such a satirist is to be taken so seriously and so copiously when others are so limited for space.

To the reader interested in religion it is perhaps disappointing, even if he feels it to be inevitable, that only fourteen pages are explicitly given to 'Church Ethics,' and these wholly taken up with Thomas Aquinas; but on more careful reading he cannot help observing that the writer is aware of the influence of Christianity on morals, though even on the grounds of judicial historic insight this influence might have been more generously treated, both in the way of recognizing its enrichment of the ethical ideal and in the way of supplying a reasonable and lovable authority to the moral agent—to say nothing of its inspiration for the acquisition of moral strength and the deliverance of the conscience from its sense of guilt and weakness.

After an exposition of four hundred and forty-six pages the writer gives us five pages of a Postscript in which he states his conclusions. Through all ethical speculation he sees a conflict between the claims of authority and the claims of freedom. To pacify these—giving weight and worth to each—is largely the task of morals and the condition of moral progress. Whether it be the rigorous demand of keeping the volume within reasonable limits, or the meticulous timidity of a scholar, that hindered him from a more thorough judicial summing up and a more constructive programme, we cannot say, but we feel that most readers will regret the exiguousness of this part of the book, especially in view of the obvious and striking merits of the historical exposition. This historical exposition itself—which is the main object of the volume—is excellently done, alike in its selection, its treatment, and its critical quality. They will value it most who best know the difficulty of the task, and their verdict, if we are not mistaken, will be that this is a clear and trustworthy review of morals worthy of all praise.

THE PROBLEM OF THE GOSPELS.

Professor Burton Scott Easton, of the General Theological Seminary, New York, whose commentary on St. Luke was so favourably received, has written a useful and significant volume on the modern subject of form-criticism as applied to the problem of the Gospels. *The Gospel before the Gospels* (Scribners; $1.75) is the title, and the aim is to establish by purely historical considerations the general reliability of the tradition about Jesus. In the furtherance of this aim the author begins with a brief sketch of the history of the study of the Synoptic problem since the dawn of the present century. We are now beginning, as he says, to reach the separate paragraphs that lie behind our documents and that were transmitted to the first Christian authors by oral means. These are the final data of the literary investigation, and it is with these that the form-criticism of the Gospels is concerned.

Initiated by Dibelius in 1919, who grappled determinedly with the question of the separate paragraphs, the subject of form-criticism has been receiving attention at the hands of Gunkel, Bultmann, Bertram, C. F. Burney, and others. In 1924 Fascher discussed the limits of the method in question.

Having concluded his historical retrospect with Fascher, Dr. Easton proceeds: 'Paradigms, stories, legends, cult-legends, epiphanies, apothegms, miracles, parables, folk-tales, controversies, dialogues, parenesis, logia, prophetic and apocalyptic utterances, church rules, sayings in the first person, allegories, poem stanzas—the research of the past decade has exhibited no poverty of terminology! But how profitable is it all? Can we really analyse forms with such precision as to make form-criticism a true discipline?' He is persuaded that, despite its limitations, the new discipline merits our full attention, if only as bringing us in contact with the earliest Christian pedagogy. But he is also persuaded that it can carry us farther than this; though it must not be regarded as historical criticism, it may prepare the way for historical criticism.

Applying the tests whereby beliefs of the Synoptic period can be distinguished with certainty from the teachings of Jesus, Dr. Easton finds the former to be most scantily supported by sayings placed in Jesus' mouth, and concludes that, so far as the sayings are concerned, the Synoptic perspective is genuine: 'The primary historic value of the Synoptists is not for their own age but for the tradition of the teachings of Jesus.' It is not that every verse and clause of the tradition is guaranteed, but that the chief criteria for the detection of foreign elements must be derived from the sayings themselves, and not from outside considerations. That there are legendary and mythical elements in the Synoptic tradition Dr. Easton is prepared to admit; yet at the most these stories simply heighten the impression that the Jesus of history actually produced.

HANDBOOK TO THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Mr. R. B. Henderson, M.A., Headmaster of Alleyn's School, Dulwich, has much experience in teaching the Old Testament to Sixth Form boys, and in his *Modern Handbook to the Old Testament* (Christophers, London; 4s. 6d. net) he presents the results of that experience. His book traverses practically every aspect of the Old Testament—its history, its literature with the ultimate constituent documents, its literary idiom, its theology, etc.—with the result that, though much useful information is conveyed, the general effect is rather discursive. We are sure that any one taught by Mr. Henderson would be left in no kind of doubt as to the living quality of Old Testament literature and history; there would not be many dull moments in his classroom; he is not afraid to suggest, for example, that Moses would have been horrified by the sacrificial system of Leviticus and all the religious ideas for which it stood. And similar courageous utterances abound.

But that is just the trouble. The book is written under the very powerful influence, which the author gratefully acknowledges, of Professor Kennett, whose pupil he was. Now while Dr. Kennett is a master of Old Testament science, he can hardly be called representative. On nearly all the big questions he goes his own way, which indeed is rather a lonely way. So we find in this volume statement after statement which would be challenged by four Old Testament scholars out of five, and even the results about which there is a broad consensus of scholarship frequently find no mention here. Our criticism is not that 'moderate' views should be preferred to 'advanced,' but that in a book intended partly for boys it might have been better to present the literary history in the form which is more or less commonly accepted. Indeed, the force of Mr. Henderson's presentation would be better understood by those who had gone through this preliminary drill.

For example, he dates the compilation of E as between 670 and 600, and of J as between 621 and 604. He places the redacted JE in the years immediately following 586 (about 581), while D is between 550 and 520. The passages in which Samuel seems to favour the idea of a monarchy are set about Zerubbabel's time, while those which deprecate that idea come probably after the time of Nehemiah. The reformation of Josiah is believed to precede the publication of Deuteronomy; the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah is to be equated with the persecuted Hasidim and therefore relegated to the Maccabæan period; *many* of the psalms belong to the second century, while in the Psalter 'seldom will anything quite unmistakably pre-exilic be discovered.' All these statements would be fiercely challenged and some of them roundly denied by not a few of the most competent Old Testament scholars of the day; and it seems a pity that a view of the history and literature should be presented to boys which would be disowned by much of the best contemporary scholarship. The book, however, is alive and stimulating, and it is capable of doing better service for those who are acquainted with the current critical view of the Old Testament than it seems likely to do for those for whose use it was intended.

JOHN BUNYAN.

It is fitting that the year 1928, being the tercentenary of the birth of John Bunyan, should see a revival of interest in his immortal work. Perhaps it is inappropriate to speak of a revival of interest, for the Dreamer and his Pilgrim are always with us. Two excellent short biographies have come to hand. The first is *John Bunyan: Pilgrim and Dreamer*, by Mr. William Henry Harding (Oliphants ; 3s. 6d. net). The writer has long been known in evangelical circles by his life of Müller of Bristol and his edition of Finney's Lectures on Revival, and this posthumous work on Bunyan will do something to keep alive his memory. It is well written and interesting, while it breathes a warm and devout spirit throughout. All the facts of Bunyan's life which are ever likely to come to light have long since been put on record, and the industry of that prince of editors, George Offor, has left little to be elucidated. Nothing remains but to set down the known facts in a fresh and telling way. This Mr. Harding has done. A single error may be noted. November 30, 1628, is the date of Bunyan's baptism, not of his birth, the exact date of which is unknown.

The second biography is *John Bunyan: His Life and Times*, by the Rev. R. Winboult Harding, B.D. (Sharp ; 2s. 6d. net). It is built on a different plan and might be regarded as supplementing the first. It does not deal so fully with the details of Bunyan's life, but gives on the one hand a really illuminating picture of his times and of the Puritan spirit, while on the other hand it devotes considerable space to a fine discussion of the Pilgrim's Progress as a masterpiece of literature, a work of art, and a religious classic. The work is done with great taste and insight, and the Personality of Bunyan is made to stand out with much clearness.

The Religious Tract Society have issued a tercentenary edition of the *Pilgrim's Progress* (6d. net). It is beautifully printed in unusually large type, with an attractive paper cover and several full-page coloured illustrations after Copping. It is a marvellous sixpence worth, but it is a pity that it contains only Part I. of the Progress and that the beautiful cover is too fragile for common use. It ought to have a wide circulation.

A dramatic version of the *Pilgrim's Progress* has been arranged by Mr. William Rix (Allen & Unwin ; 2s. net). The main outline of the story is skilfully presented, and the situations are handled with considerable success. Full directions are given as to dress and staging. It would be a fine undertaking for any Church Guild or Young People's Society to present the drama in the coming winter—a difficult task certainly, but most educative.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE STATE.

Christianity and the State, by the Right Rev. William Temple, Bishop of Manchester (Macmillan ; 4s. 6d. net), is one of the series of Scott Holland Lectures, dealing with the religious sanctions of social and political life. Dr. Temple, as all know, is widely read in classical and historic sociology. He is in close touch with the problems of industry, as a Bishop of Manchester can hardly fail to be. He is a master of emphatic and fluent speech. The result is that this book is a rapid, allusive, open-minded survey of many centuries, with most interesting characterizations and comments. But it seldom reaches undeniable conclusions. His pages are too few to allow him to summarize adequately sociology from Plato to Karl Marx, with a look in on the minds of a host of writers, including Machiavelli, Spinoza, and Hobbes, as he passes on. A well-read man would find it sketchy. The average reader is not enlightened. He begins by maintaining the thesis that the modern State must be Christian, based on the reality of God, and functioning through faith in Him. The fact of Christ is not often mentioned. He translates this basis into four 'principles'—the Sanctity of Personality, the Fact of Fellowships, the Obligation of Service, consummating in Sacrifice. These necessitate community, and the State is the 'organ of community.' Its authority is expressed in Law, and must be maintained by Force. Thereby order, well-being, and liberty are maintained. Thus a definition is reached: 'The State is the necessary organ of the national community, maintaining through Law—as promulgated by a government endowed to this end with coercive power—the universal conditions of social order' (p. 123). It is this State which has authority over the other 'cohesions' of Society—'the family, trade union, church, and the rest.'

From this position the writer proceeds to touch with verve and vivacity on the issues of the day. Facing two of the urgent questions, he suggests the creation of Industrial and Educational Parliaments, without fearing that these might become magnified, selfish, and more potent and defiant Trade Unions. With a generally adverse attitude to war, he reaches the verdict of its lawfulness and necessity on occasions. Now and again, on other present-day questions there are sentences which seem to disclose a mind not wholly resolved. In discussing the question of private property, he writes: 'A Chris-

tian Sociology will desire that every citizen should possess enough property to support bare life, even though he does no stroke of work for it; for so his work and service will be more nearly free, and personality will have a fuller scope' (p. 98). That does not seem to be in accord with either the ethics of Christ or of Paul. But a broader criticism questions some of his more fundamental positions. The State is not to be defined as an 'organ' of the community. An 'organ' has no independent will. The State is an organism, which, in some forms, has been independent of the community. It is not a construction, as Dr. Temple clearly proves, yet it is not a 'growth' as he maintains. It is an evolution. A growth from a seed or a root is a different thing from an evolution. Ever and again he comes into touch with the neglected truth, that the Christian State is an evolution from the family. Its principles are not the four given such prominence here. They are justice, truth, mercy, goodwill, consummating in goodwill's highest form of love. Motived by these, the State will become not only the Kingdom of God, but the Family of God the Father, here and now on earth—and, as the prophets affirm, for evermore. That is the conclusion Bishop Temple desires.

After publishing a series of commentaries which covers the whole range of the Old Testament, Canon Sell in a new volume takes up the task of explaining the significance of *The Talmud, Mishnah and Midrash* (Church Missionary Society, Salisbury Square, London; 1s. 6d.). This volume displays the same power as the commentaries of getting to the heart of a complicated problem and saying about it just the things that matter. While Canon Sell is a very learned man, he does not allow his learning to be smothered by pedantry or even to be obtruded at all; he has the gift of speaking to the plain man in a way that he can understand. So here we find much valuable information, clearly put, about the Targums, etc., and the wisdom of the Canon is shown in devoting most of his space to a discussion of the Midrash, whose often fantastic quality he vividly sets forth in numerous illustrations. Against these we can appreciate more than ever the wonderful sanity of the Bible. A section is also devoted to the heretical 'Minim' and to some of the doctrinal views represented by the Rabbinical literature. This volume is a worthy supplement to Canon Sell's series of commentaries.

The Deed and the Doom of Jesus (T. & T. Clark; 1s. 6d.), by Mr. Francis Herbert Stead, M.A., purports to provide a new line of approach to the theory of the Atonement. Mr. Stead regards the old images and approaches as obsolescent, and is of the opinion that for terms sacrificial or commercial, feudal or governmental, we should substitute nowadays more immediate terms of the mind itself. Accordingly, he examines the bearing on the experience of Jesus of the Law of Habit, in which the constancy of God expresses itself as succession, and of the Law of Reciprocity, in which it expresses itself as co-existence. These two Laws are represented as making inevitable the sufferings of Jesus as One who broke through the racial habit of sin, freeing men from the power and penalty in it, and who was also the perfect embodiment of reciprocity, maintaining His loyalty and sensitiveness in a sinful world, and rousing thereby a response of new sensitiveness and loyalty. But, even so, we fail to see that Mr. Stead has made any real contribution to the theory of the Atonement. We should add that his essay is none the less interesting and readable.

The Rev. Paul P. Levertoff, author of several learned contributions to Biblical scholarship, has published in pamphlet form under the title *St. Paul in Jewish Thought* (Diocesan House, London; 2s.) three lectures delivered, on the invitation of the Bishop of London, at the Church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields in September 1927. The lectures were attended by a mixed audience of Jews and Christians. The first lecture, 'St. Paul and his Jewish Contemporaries,' finds a direct polemic against St. Paul in Midrash Sifre, and contrasts with it the view of St. Paul given by the late Dr. Schiller-Szinessy of Cambridge. The second lecture is on 'Claude Montefiore's Criticism and Appreciation of St. Paul'; and the third is on 'A Jewish Dramatist's Presentation of St. Paul,' being an account (reprinted from 'Theology') of Franz Werfel's 'Paulus unter den Juden.' An appendix treats of the Russian philosopher Soloviov's views on Judaism and Christianity.

It was a good idea of Mr. G. R. Holt Shafto and Mr. A. Gordon James to link together the names of *Moses and Jesus* in their study of the Decalogue (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). Their book, which rests on the belief that human society must have a religious basis and that the Decalogue is a fundamental document of sociology, is in effect a discussion of the Decalogue in the light of the New

Testament. The discussion is not concerned with its historical origin, but with its sociological implications, as a guide to the excellent way of fellowship with God and man, without which the ideal human society is unattainable. It is pointed out that characteristically Jesus is more interested in the precepts of 'probity' than of 'piety.' The Commandments are taken *seriatim*, explained in their original intention, and then set forth in the deeper meaning elicited from them by Jesus.

The writers keep the modern world steadily in view and drop many wise *obiter dicta*. For example, on the eighth Commandment, 'A just economic order can only be brought about by the co-operation of persons, not by the redistribution of things.' On the sixth, 'War in general cannot be justified by the teaching of Jesus. The final guarantee of international peace is' not pacts, treaties, and leagues, but 'the recognition by the community of the supreme necessity of fostering fellowship and encouraging a spirit of goodwill.'

The Religious Basis of Citizenship (Epworth Press ; 2s. 6d. net) is an enlargement of a number of addresses by Mr. V. Donald Siddons, D.F.C., B.A., to a Summer School at High Leigh, Hertfordshire, where a group of young men and women of the Wesleyan Methodist Church met in a conference on social questions. It is an examination and interpretation of the witness by the Scriptures to a religious ideal of citizenship, with some attention to the post-apostolic conception of society. Beginning with an estimate of the basis to be discerned in the Old Testament, it enters more inquiringly into the mind of the New Testament believers. It faces the problem raised by the illusory hopes of the early Christian Church as to the coming of the Kingdom and its King. It closes, after stressing the universality of the Kingdom of God, with a discussion of its demands upon the political and social life of Christian men, and a statement of the ideal as that of citizenship busy in the building of the City of God. Its English style is clear and concise, and its accent of moral earnestness falls pleasantly on the mental ear. It is easy to understand the impression these addresses made on the company of young believers who accepted their premises, and were roused to chivalrous enthusiasm for their ideal. But the writer seems at times to be too much under the sway of one or two of the many authorities he cites. That seems most evident in two regards. The first is as to the social function of the Church. That depends largely on its environment. It was one thing in the early centuries. It is another in a heathen land of to-day. It is another within the British Isles. In the other regard the thought of the City is sometimes regarded as simply a city, to whose service there is a first call to a young believer. But the 'City of God' is really a figure drawn from past ages when city-states, such as Jerusalem and Athens, held men's allegiance, not to their civic life but to their wide *imperium*. Yet the ideal here presented holds, and it would be more potent with a wider application. As a reader closes the volume, he wonders where Christ comes in. There is no clear statement as to His place and office in the City of God.

The Book and the Vote, by Bishop Herbert Hensley Henson, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton ; 2s. 6d. net), is a collection of recent sermons and articles promoted by the Prayer Book discussions. The organization of the National Church as an autonomous denomination by the 'Enabling Act' of 1919 and the recent conflict between the autonomous Church and the House of Commons have combined to create a situation which may compel the Bishop of Durham to reverse his policy of a lifetime and to favour disestablishment with concomitant disendowment, as the only course consistent with the Church's self-respect : 'That the Church, Clergy and Laity, united in corporate action, should be controlled in spiritual matters [that is, in the Revision of the Prayer Book] by an authority which is not Christian offends Protestants not less than other Christians.' 'In the Enabling Act of 1919 an attempt was made to effect a *modus vivendi* between a secularized State and a denominational Church. The action of the House of Commons on December 15th, 1927, registers the failure of that attempt, and reveals a situation of fundamental discord between Church and State.'

By the various statements brought together in this volume Dr. Henson endeavours to explain the actual changes effected by the revision of the Prayer Book and to urge their acceptance by the Church and the nation. The articles on 'The Composite Book' and 'The Passing of National Churches' have already appeared in journals ; of the five other items here printed, the sermons on 'Church and State in England' and on 'Civilization and Christianity' are less immediately topical than the rest.

We do not think that Dr. Henson, closely as he keeps himself in touch with ecclesiastical movements in Scotland, is right in coupling together as

he does the 'Enabling Act' of 1919 and the Church of Scotland Act of 1921. It may be that both Acts are 'in principle' Acts of disestablishment, but it can hardly be said of the Scottish Church, in view of the more recent legislature concerning the 'temporalities,' that 'disestablishment *eo nomine* is postponed because it would necessitate also disendowment.'

Mr. A. M. Coleman has issued in pamphlet form *The Biblical Text of Lucifer of Cagliari* (*Acts*) (J. H. Lawrence, Welwyn, Herts). Bishop Lucifer wrote in exile in the East in 355–362, and must have brought his Latin Bible with him. His abundant quotations from Acts are here collated with the text of *gig* (Gigas Holmiensis), with which they are in close agreement.

Hard Sayings of Jesus (Lindsey Press; 2s.) is a paper-covered booklet by the Rev. J. Tyssul Davis, B.A., Minister of the Theistic Church, containing seven interesting and suggestive 'talks' on some of the high precepts contained in the Sermon on the Mount and other parts of the record of Jesus' teaching. Mr. Davis acknowledges the moral and religious leadership of Jesus, but repudiates the claims made for Him in the Christian creed. He would set the Christ alongside the Buddha and the other Great Teachers, finding a parallelism of message in them all.

The Ultimate Epoch, and Other Essays (Longmans; 6s. net), by Mr. Arthur John Hubbard, M.D., shows a lively interest in New Testament problems, but is of a strangely heterogeneous character. The burden of the first essay is that neither the pursuit of worldly interest nor the exercise of compulsion makes for a permanently satisfactory system of society; what is needed is the Logos in the world, and in Scripture an immense epoch for the future of the Logos in the world is foreshadowed. A contrast to the vague discursiveness of the first essay is furnished by the second, in which it is boldly claimed that an examination of the three records of the storm on the Lake of Galilee shows John, the son of Zebedee ('Boat Owner and Wholesale Fishmonger!') to have been the author of the Fourth Gospel. The third essay affirms that the Gospels represent successive attempts to transmit an adequate record of our Lord's life; while the fourth and concluding essay finds the origin of the custom of early morning communion in the necessity of assembling together, if there was to be any assembling together at all, after the *ergastula* (the slave-barracks) were opened and before the day's work had begun.

The present position of Old Testament criticism and the main factors which have led up to it are admirably sketched by Professor A. S. Peake in his Lecture on *Recent Developments in Old Testament Criticism* (Longmans; 1s. 6d. net). The Old Testament problem is so intricate and many-sided that this skilful presentation of its main outlines is doubly welcome. Beginning with 1753, when Astruc's famous book raised the Pentateuchal problem, Dr. Peake brings the discussion down to its most recent phases, dealing, for example, in the case of Deuteronomy, with the extreme and contrasted views of Hölscher and Welch. It is reassuring to learn that Professor Peake regards as 'secure' the identification of the Deuteronomic Code with the programme of Josiah's Reformation. The prophets, especially Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, are discussed, also Daniel and the Psalter. Professor Peake joins Hölscher in his opposition to the Maccabæan dating of large sections of prophecy, and he would agree with Gunkel that there is a not inconsiderable pre-exilic element in the Psalter. That Old Testament criticism is, broadly speaking, on the right lines and is not simply producing results which are destined to be overthrown is suggested by Dr. Peake's deliberate summary: 'the net result,' he says, 'of the recent critical movement, it seems to me, is that we are left in the main very much where we were a quarter of a century ago.' To students confused by the mass of critical detail, this discussion, with its clear emphasis upon the salient things, should render a valuable service.

A great deal of useful information, of which the non-professional student of the Bible stands badly in need, is contained in Mr. Conrad A. Skinner's book, *Concerning the Bible* (Sampson Low; 5s. net). He acknowledges his obvious debt to the popular books of Dr. J. Paterson Smyth of Montreal, who honours the book with a Foreword. Mr. Skinner deals with the origin, growth, contents, and inspiration of the Bible in an interesting and racy fashion, tracing the story of the Bible back from the Revised Version through the early English Bibles to the ultimate MSS on which Old Testament and New Testament rest, and giving useful hints as to the nature of J, E, P, and similar matters little known to the average Bible reader. The part of the book that will most help such a reader to a right attitude to the Bible is the discussion of Inspiration and

Authority, where Mr. Skinner makes the point that it is the experiences recorded and not the record of them that is inspired. Mr. Skinner does not conceal his preference of the prophet to the priest: sacrifice he considers 'a base conception at best.' While the prophets were striving to make religion personal and responsible, with the priests 'it is always, "Somebody else."'

Any book which relates to the Lord's Supper arouses instant and watchful attention to-day. In *The Truth about Fasting*, with especial reference to Fasting-Communion (Rivingtons; 3s. 6d. net), we have an historical inquiry, as remarkable for its scholarly survey of the evidence of all the Christian centuries, as for its decisive and indefeasible proof of its main declaration. Its author, Professor Percy Dearmer, of King's College, London, is recognized as a master in the history of the early Church, and especially in the records of its worship. Here he begins with a courteous statement of the practical difficulties of fasting at an early hour, so as to partake of the elements after such a prescription. Then he summons up the evidence against it, drawn from the teachers of all the Christian ages, and presents an amazing succession of witnesses. Three especially notable instances may be cited. The first is the neglect, almost desertion, of communion by the English people. 'The spectacle has become common of an early service, at which in a parish of many thousands there are present some twenty women, and two or three men, with the working classes unrepresented, except for a few servant girls.' 'The Bishop of Southwark stated that the communicants in his diocese were less than 5 per cent.' The early hour, to secure Fasting-Communion, has been the powerful factor in this decrease. The second is the fresh and convincing examination of Pliny's Letter to Trajan, which, as Professor Dearmer shows, when quoted as a whole, has no reference at all to early communion. The third is the roll of evidence he unfolds from those who have given Fasting-Communion no special sanction. Even Pusey writes: 'There is no irreverence in non-fasting communion. In some cases there would be a direct conflict between our Lord's command and the observance of this pious custom.' But the final argument is that this demand rests upon a materialistic view of the elements, against which the Church of England has made its protest, as the evidence adduced clearly proves, down all the centuries.

Messrs. Seeley, Service & Co. have added three more volumes to their handy and lavishly illustrated 'Things Seen' Series of travel guide-books (3s. 6d. net). These deal with *Things Seen in Madeira*, by J. Edith Hutcheon, F.R.G.S.; *Things Seen in the Dolomites*, by L. M. Davidson, F.R.G.S.; and *Things Seen in the Bay of Naples*, by A. G. Mackinnon, M.A. The writers not only know their subjects thoroughly, but can deal with them with the appreciation of enthusiasts and the further attraction of an admirable literary style. To those who can spend the time and the money, each of these territories has its own peculiar attractions. Those who have neither the time nor the money may nevertheless spend many pleasant hours in an arm-chair in most enjoyable company. They may stand on the edge of the crater of Vesuvius and look into the boiling and steaming abyss, with no risk of being overcome by the sulphurous fumes. Mr. Mackinnon, who writes of the enchantments around the Bay of Naples, is one of the best of guides.

The Rev. David Ross Fotheringham, M.A., F.R.A.S., Vicar of Charing, has written a little book on *The Date of Easter and other Christian Festivals* (S.P.C.K.; paper 1s. 6d., cloth 2s. 6d.). Lord Desborough, who brought forward a Bill in 1921 fixing Easter for the Second Sunday in April, writes a commendatory preface. In the first three sections of the book the dates of our Lord's Nativity, Baptism, and Crucifixion are considered in the light of the documentary evidence; and in the last section the exclusion of the Lunar calendar is advocated, and the appointment of April 9th as the basic date for a fixed or stabilized Easter. Obviously Mr. Fotheringham handles his subject with competence, and that it is a subject of topical interest as well as of importance is evidenced by the fact that in 1926 a Committee of the League of Nations recommended that Easter should be 'the Sunday following the second Saturday in April'—with which Mr. Fotheringham's proposal is in agreement.

God and His Works (S.P.C.K.; paper 2s. 6d., cloth 3s. 6d.) is No. 40 of the publishers' 'Texts for Students.' It consists of selections from Part I. of the 'Summa Theologica' of St. Thomas Aquinas. These have been arranged by the Rev. A. G. Hebert, M.A., who also supplies an Introduction, in which the question is discussed whether St. Thomas is a Platonist or an Aristotelian. The arrangement of the material is clear and orderly, and the understanding of the text is facilitated by

(iii. 10). So there must not be the slightest breath of suspicion about a Church official. He must be 'sans peur et sans reproche' (ἀνέγκλητος, ἀνεπίλημπτος; 1 Ti 3^2 5^7; cf. v.[14]), lest the cause should suffer. Cicero commends to Quintus the example of Cyrus, who blended 'summa gravitas' with 'singularis comitas.' So Timothy is to instruct with πραότης (*comitas*, 2 Ti 2^{25}), and Titus is to show gravity, σεμνότης (Tit 2^7), in his instruction. Cicero censures his brother's *iracundia* and *acerbitas* (xiv. 40), and says his letters have made him 'patientior leniorque.' 'A bishop also must not have this wrathful disposition,' ὄργιλος (Tit 1^7). He must be ἐπιεικής (1 Ti 3^3), not πλήκτης (Tit 1^7) like the 'plagosus' Orbilius, who instructed young Horace. Cicero's advice to Quintus, 'to be temperate, to restrain all desires, to control one's people, to show oneself easy of access and ready to listen to argument,' might have served as a text for the Pastorals. He also urged Quintus to give all his attention to his work, '*incumbe* toto animo et omni studio' (ix. 271); cf. 1 Ti $4^{15.\ 16}$, 'ponder these things, be wholly engaged in them,' ἐν τούτοις ἴσθι (cf. 'totus in illis'), 'attend to yourself and the teaching, continue in them.' Cicero appeals to the 'common faith which is owed to all men' ('communis fides quae omnibus debetur'), Paul to the common faith, κατὰ κοινὴν πίστιν (Tit 1^4), possessed by all Christians. Cicero reminds Quintus of his studious youth and virtuous life (x. 29); as Paul reminds Timothy of his youthful studies (2 Ti 3^{14}). One says the governor must show hospitality and friendship (v. 16); the other says the bishop must be hospitable, φιλόξενος (1 Ti 3^2, Tit 1^8). These are striking parallels. In letters of similar import similar sayings would occur, but the similar mentality of these writers cannot be so explained. Both writers lay stress on the same principles of government, often in the very same phrases. Both consider the final cause of the Law. Cicero declares it to be 'the greatest happiness of the governed' (8. 24); St. Paul, 'love' (1 Ti 1^5). Says Cicero, 'If you were set over fierce and barbarous nations, it would be the object of your humanity to consult their interests and serve their welfare (*salus*), and give your whole attention to love them, protect them, and make them happy' (8. 23). The writer of the Pastorals writes as a cultivated Roman Christian. His ideas move in a distinctly Roman circle. His thoughts and aims are projected along the distinctly Roman lines of personal dignity, piety, obedience to superior officers, equity in judgment, moderation, integrity, self-control, discipline, organization, and faithfulness to one's trust. . . . The proprætor and his staff of officials and officers, his quæstor, legati, and all the ministers of the government, working together for the moral and material welfare (*salus*) of the provincials, and displaying a wise discretion and polished *humanitas*, might well serve as a prototype of the Christian bishop, and his entourage of presbyters, deacons, and others, all working for the spiritual well-being (*salus*) of the Christian community. The governor himself, easy to approach at all hours, 'in season and out of season' (2 Ti 4^2), not only in his court-house, but even in his bedroom (*cubiculum*, 8. 3); listening to the troubles of his people, careful to avoid the least breath of scandal, and the slightest attempt at bribery, a sort of 'divine man' dropped down from heaven into the province (ii. 7), in whose eyes the safety, children, reputation, and property of his subjects are the dearest things on earth (iv. 13); discreet in his choice of friends, a wise and fair, grave, self-controlled, humane, stately, cultured gentleman, treating all with generosity and showing hospitality and friendship to those of worthy character—is an admirable picture of what a Church ruler should be. Governors like Ambrose of Milan, who fashioned their lives according to Cicero's sketch, proved the best bishops after the standard of the Pastorals.

The mentality of the writer of the Pastorals is Roman in the highest sense, according to the highest Roman traditions, such as the outlook of one would become who had realized through contact with pure Romans the superiority of their 'gravitas' and 'pietas' to the levity and insincerity of the Greeks, and the value of his own citizenship as a Roman in the greatest empire on earth.

There are some one hundred and sixty words and phrases in the Pastorals which are distinctly Latin. We can substitute *disciplina* (= discipulina) for διδασκαλία (sing.) in every passage, the former being used both of instruction and system. We have the Latin introduction to a proverb 'verum illud verbum,' in πίστος ὁ λόγος (the article is rarely found because the Latin has none). Δι' ἣν αἰτίαν, almost peculiar to the Pastorals in NT, frequently in Diodorus Siculus, the Latin-Greek writer, represents *quam ob rem* or *causam*; χάριν ἔχω is the Latin 'gratiam habeo,' also in Diodorus, etc. With Jesus 'our hope' (1 Ti 1^1) compare Scipio 'our every hope' ('spem omnem,' Livy, 28. 39). The τινες, of contempt, several times in Pastorals, is the Latin 'quidam,' used in same way (Terence, *Eun.* iii. 2. 20). 'In me the gods showed all their power' (Terence, *Eun.* v. 8. 3). 'In me Christ Jesus showed all patience' (1 Ti 1^{16}). πας all

through represents the Latin *summus* (Tit 2^{15}), 'rebuke with supreme (πάσης) authority'; cf. Cicero, *Att.* i. 17. 8, 'I rebuked the Senate *cum summâ auctoritate.*' 'Sinners of whom I am first' (πρῶτος) recalls 'princeps sceleris' (Cicero, Cluent). 'This is right and acceptable' (1 Ti 2^{3}) is the 'gratum acceptumque' of Cicero. Women *professing* godliness or religion (of 1 Ti 2^{10}) are in contrast to the 'professae,' the women whose calling was afterwards described by Tacitus as a 'professio flagitii' (*Ann.* ii. 85), and who were debarred from the καταστολή, or long robe. The writer even attempted to put Horace's 'non erubescendus' into Greek (2 Ti 2^{15}). It is the Latin that helps to explain 2 Ti 2^{15}, as driving a straight furrow in the field of truth, for the ploughman must not *praevaricate* (Pliny, 18. 19). The confusion between 'elder' (presbyter) of age and 'elder' (presbyter) of office in 1 Ti 5^{1} and 5^{17} is not in the Latin, which has 'senior' in the former and 'presbyteri' in the latter. The confusion between '*deacon*' of office in 1 Ti 3^{8} and διάκονος in the sense of servant of Christ (1 Ti 4^{6}) is not in the Latin, which here has 'minister' and there 'diaconi.' 'Their word will spread as a *gangrene*' (2 Ti 2^{17}), a metaphorical expression found in Varro (26 B.C.). 'Quippe qui,' seeing that, or inasmuch as, underlies ὅστις on the six occasions. The difficult passage (2 Ti 2^{20}), the firm *themelios* of God *standeth* having this seal, 'the Lord knoweth,' etc., where a 'foundation' which always 'lies' elsewhere here stands, may be explained as a boundary stone, a *terminus* or *cippus* which stood erect, and often bore an inscription (Horace, S. 2. 6. 38). See Ovid, *Fasti*, ii., where the stone itself is called 'Terminus,' dividing one field from another. Here there is a division made by the *themelios* between the Lord's people and those who are not. The Romans sealed letters and things. We have *membranae, paenula* (2 Ti 4^{11}), *aniles fabellae* (Hor.) in γραώδεις μῦθοι (1 Ti 4^{7}), *irrepere* of insidious entry in ἐνδύνοντες (2 Ti 3^{6}), and numerous other phrases in which a Latin word may lurk.

Furthermore, in the grand sonorous passages (2 Ti 3, 1 Ti $1^{5\text{-}20}$) there is more of Cicero than Demosthenes. In the Pastorals and in the Orations of Cicero we have the same piling up of crimes, the same intensive accumulation of sinister attributes. In his lurid but vivid pictures of Catiline, Antony, Dolabella, and Verres, Cicero is unsurpassed. His mordant tongue eventually lost him his head. Antony would not forget. And yet the passage that most resembles *Philippic*, iii. 14, 'nostis insolentiam Antonii,' etc., is 2 Ti $3^{1\text{-}9}$. Albeit more refined, it is an equally awful picture, and expressed in similar sonorous sesquipedalian words. We see the stealthy entrance of the false teachers, under the semblance of the religion whose reality they have forsworn, into the homes of women, women who have had a baneful past, but are struggling out into the light, just to be dragged back into hell and darkness. On the other hand, we are in the stately hall of Varro, a home of study, a treasury of art, and one of Antony's banquets is in progress; it is a scene of profligacy, abandonment, and temptation and 'madness,' the very word Paul used of the false teachers. By the side of the list of crimes, each with an awful picture behind it, in 1 Ti 1^{9}, we can place the descriptions of *Catiline*, ii. 4. The parallels are striking. For Nero, matricide, parricide, murderer, impurest and wickedest of men, and his boon companions, men of finish but of vice, were like Catiline and his crew, 'opposed to sound moral teaching.' On the other hand, we have charming pictures in Cicero of stately homes, great ladies of high reputation, delightful children, kind-hearted gentlemen like Lepidus (*Phil.* 13. 4), and a most virtuous discipline, 'sanctissima disciplina,' like that of Pompey (*Phil.* 2. 28). Such pictures may have suggested to Paul that the children of the clergy, inferior and higher, might be equally 'optatissimi,' their wives equally 'probatissimae,' and their home discipline equally 'sanctissima.' But it is in Cicero's letters that we find the most numerous and striking parallels to the Pastorals. A few may be mentioned here. Tiro, like Timothy, was delicate, both being κακοστόμαχος. As Paul prescribed wine for Timothy, Cicero prescribed it for Tiro. Paul had a weakness for Timothy. He was aware that he was criticised for appointing one so young. Cicero appointed Caelius his quæstor to take charge of Asia until the new consul arrived. 'Puerum, inquies, et fortasse fatuum et non gravem, et non continentem,' (*Att.* vi. 6), 'a foolish youth neither σεμνός nor σώφρων (cf. Tit 2^{2}), you will say. But the appointment suited my old age.' Paul 'the aged' would have made the same excuse. With Paul's friendship for the youthful Timothy, compare Cicero's affection for Marcus Marcellus (*Fam.* xv. 9), 'I hear that in all your sayings, actions, studies, and pursuits you are like me'; cf. 2 Ti 3^{10} ('omnibus dictis factis studiis, institutis'). Paul praised Timothy for following his instruction, way of life, purpose, faith, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ, τῇ ἀγωγῇ. With Paul's interest in Timothy's improvement (1 Ti 4^{15}), cf. Cicero (*Fam.* xv. 16*a*), where, writing to his son, he says, 'I have just had a letter which shows that he is making progress' (same word προκοπή). We have

mentator who rarely failed to reach a decision on an exegetical problem, and as rarely failed to regard it as unquestionably right. I am so conscious myself of the even balance of argument in numerous cases and the absence of warrant for any confident decision, that I am constantly amazed at the assurance with which B. Weiss gives his dogmatic judgments. Of the higher exegetical genius such as his gifted son displayed I find little if any trace; but what can be done by unshrinking labour and width of knowledge, that he succeeded in doing.

Wellhausen's commentaries, with which his Introduction to the first three Gospels might be taken, were of quite a different order. These slim volumes, closely packed with matter, fresh and independent, speaking where the author felt he had something of his own to say, silent where he had nothing to add, were everywhere recognized as of the first importance. The most eminent master in the field of Old Testament scholarship, he had much to contribute from his store of Semitic learning, and the skill in critical analysis displayed in his studies of the Hexateuch, Judges, Samuel, and Kings raised high expectations for his critical operations on the Gospels. His radicalism, however, was extreme. Accepting the Two-document theory, he made Q later than Mark and dependent upon it. He regarded its material as the creation of the Jerusalem Church, and believed that Mark had left extremely little authentic matter for his successors to glean. Even in Mark not a little was dismissed as legendary. One whole section was regarded as composed of duplicate narratives. Another section had been 'Christianized' and was therefore largely non-authentic. Thus the genuine tradition was reduced to very slender proportions. Critics generally have failed to follow his lead; but he has given great stimulus to the study of the Gospels and made valuable contributions to the exegesis. I should add that 'Mark,' 'Matthew,' and the 'Introduction' appeared in second editions.

In Lietzmann's *Handbuch*, Klostermann's Mark has appeared in a thoroughly revised and expanded edition. I have already explained the general features of this series, and this volume maintains its reputation. The editor has been greatly influenced by Wellhausen.

In French we have Loisy's *Les Évangiles Synoptiques*. This massive work of more than eighteen hundred large pages represented a standpoint less extreme than that since reached by the author, but still very radical. It displays very full knowledge of the most important literature, and the exegetical discussion is thorough. An independent commentary on Mark came out later, and he has recently published a larger volume on Luke. In the latter the author has been much influenced by the study of literary types ('Formgeschichtliche Methode'), which has recently been prosecuted with much ardour in Germany, and also by the belief that the Christian cultus exercised great influence on the Gospel narrative. Historical scepticism has gone almost as far as it can go without the denial of the historicity of Jesus. I might also call attention to his translation of the New Testament ('Les Livres du Nouveau Testament'), which contains introductions to the separate books and groups of books.

The unfortunate view that Mark was later than Matthew and had drawn largely from him, naturally led to its being the Gospel most neglected by commentators. Now that it is almost universally regarded as the oldest and as the original from which Luke and Matthew largely drew the historical sections they have in common with it, the Second Gospel has attracted the attention of several commentators. Gould in the *ICC* is a serviceable though scarcely a distinguished piece of work, now more than thirty years old. The best commentary in English is Rawlinson (*West. C.*). It is a disadvantage that it is based on the Revised Version and not on the original, and that for a philological treatment it is necessary to go elsewhere. But it is abreast of the critical and exegetical discussion in Germany as well as Great Britain. In particular it is the one commentary on the Gospels which takes full account of the work done on the literary types. It is indeed quite possible that it may be too sympathetic with the exponents of this method, and that the narratives were not originally disconnected stories put together by the author like beads on a string, and therefore not available for any confident reconstruction as to the course of the ministry. But at least the editor tries to bring home the uncertainty of the reconstructions which assume Mark's order to be chronological. And on the exegetical side it is throughout a work of high merit.

In the *Cambridge Greek Testament* we have Plummer. He was a very prolific commentator, writing in the *ICC*, of which he was one of the New Testament editors, on Luke and 2 Corinthians, and completing Robertson's commentary on 1 Corinthians. In the *CGT*, in addition to Mark, he edited John, 2 Corinthians, and the Epistles of John. Early in his career he did Peter and Jude for the *New Testament Commentary for English*

Readers. He contributed the volumes on the Pastoral Epistles, James and Jude to the *Expositor's Bible.* He wrote independent commentaries on Matthew, Philippians, and 1 and 2 Thessalonians. His exegetical output had accordingly a very wide range. He had been a pupil of Döllinger's and translated some of his books, so he was well equipped on the side of German scholarship. And he wrote also on Church history. His books have considerable merits, wide knowledge of the literature of the subject, sound scholarship, and good sense. But industry, sobriety, and learning do not make a commentator of the first rank, and in the higher and deeper qualities of the heaven-sent exegete it would probably be generally admitted that he was deficient. At the same time for general use his books are often excellent.

Bartlet's Mark (*Cent. B.*) is a great improvement on Salmond, in close contact with foreign as well as British discussions, and marked by considerable independence and freshness. It should be remembered that his solution of the Synoptic problem differs somewhat from that generally accepted; but this does not affect the treatment of Mark so much as of the other Synoptists. To the ill-fated *Oxford Church Commentary* Allen contributed the only New Testament issue which was published before the enterprise came to its regrettable end. He had the very great advantage of being a competent Aramaic scholar, and this gave the commentary a distinction all its own among our British works. It includes a translation in which so far as possible the roughness of Mark's style is retained. The notes are often fresh and suggestive; the main defect of the book—and it is rather serious—is that it is not a good deal fuller.

Of commentaries which do not appear in a series the best known is probably Swete. The author was a very learned scholar who had done much for Biblical study by his manual edition of the Septuagint and by his *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek.* He was also an accomplished patristic scholar. In textual criticism and Greek scholarship his commentaries are admirable. For the purely exegetical qualities one would pass much the same judgment on his work as on Plummer's.

From these safe, sober, unadventurous, and rather commonplace interpretations we turn with quickened interest to the volumes of Menzies and Bacon. With them we are right out into the full international stream. One may agree with them or disagree with them, but they bring the student into touch with the living problems and treat them in a very stimulating way. *The Earliest Gospel,* by the former of these scholars, did bring a new strain into British treatment of the Gospels. Bacon's *The Beginnings of Gospel Story* opened a series of investigations on the Second Gospel which culminated in his large volume, *The Gospel of Mark.* His critical theories may not command assent, and his treatment of the record may seem unduly sceptical; but he shows great freshness and originality, and his discussion of the individual problems has behind it a coherent theory as to the Gospel history and the development of the literature of primitive Christianity.

Of the German commentaries I have already mentioned those by B. Weiss, J. Weiss, Holtzmann, Klostermann, Wellhausen. There remains Wohlenberg (*ZK*), a painstaking work but not on the level of Zahn's own work or indeed of some other contributors to the series. But it supplies a useful counterweight to some of the more radical expositions.

In French, besides the small volume by Loisy already mentioned, we have a full and excellent Roman Catholic Commentary by Lagrange (1911). It has a very long and thorough introduction, and the commentary itself is very full. The author is an accomplished Semitic scholar and has written an important work on Semitic religions. I may take this opportunity of adding that the commentaries in the same series (*Études Bibliques*) on Matthew, Luke, John, Romans, and Galatians are all from his hand. As is natural in a French commentary, a good deal of attention is paid to Loisy's views.

On Matthew, Allen (*ICC*) is very thorough so far as the criticism goes, defending a somewhat different theory from that commonly taken. On the exegetical side he is far too meagre, so much so indeed that Plummer wrote his *Exegetical Commentary* in order to make good this deficiency. The volume by B. T. D. Smith (*CB*), just published at last, takes the place of Carr's long, antiquated work. It is within its limits a good piece of work in touch with some of the best recent criticism and exegesis. In view of the Jewish character of the first Gospel it was an excellent idea to entrust the new edition in the *Century Bible* to Box. One could wish that he had had more space, but he has contrived to pack a good deal into it. Micklem (*West. C.*) is on a larger scale and contains much useful matter, but it would have been better if reference to other commentaries had not been excluded. Our foremost commentary is that by McNeile, based on the Greek text and in close contact with the best exegetical literature, foreign as well as British. The author

has the advantage of being also an Old Testament scholar. I may take this opportunity of mentioning the Warburton lectures by Dr. Lukyn Williams—*The Hebrew Christian Messiah* (1916). Strictly this is not in place in an article on Commentaries ; but the author's Jewish learning is specially valuable for the exposition of the first Gospel, to which the volume is devoted.

Of foreign commentaries on Matthew, I need not say more on B. Weiss (*Mey.*), Holtzmann (*HC*), Zahn (*ZK*), J. Weiss (*SNT*). I should add, however, that Klostermann (*HNT*) has appeared in a second edition, very thoroughly revised and taking account of fresh investigations down to 1926.

Luke has come off rather badly in British exegesis. Plummer (*ICC*) was published nearly a third of a century ago. It is still the fullest of our modern commentaries. Farrar (*CGT*) was published in 1884 ; an adequate commentary to replace it in that series has been long overdue. Adeney (*Cent. B.*) has been rather slightly revised for the second edition ; it is a useful, popular work. Ragg (*West. C.*) is a good specimen of that series and not too technical. The most recent is the commentary by Easton, a distinguished American scholar. I should personally have preferred a different arrangement of the material, and the strictly exegetical notes are often unduly brief. But it is a thorough piece of work, in constant contact with the best and most recent literature. Adequate attention is given to the lower and higher criticism of the book, and we have at present no commentary to place beside it.

Nothing need be added with reference to the commentaries by Holtzmann (*HC*), B. Weiss (*Mey.*), J. Weiss (*SNT*), Zahn (*ZK*), or Lagrange. Wellhausen was not able to prepare a second edition of this commentary (1904). Klostermann's was written in collaboration with Gressmann (1919); a second edition has not yet appeared.

On the Gospel of John we have no good recent commentary. Bernard in the *ICC* is in the press, though it is unfortunate that the author did not live to see it through. It will no doubt contain much valuable matter, but whether it will prove to be the commentary for which we have been waiting to give us a quite satisfactory exposition cannot be said until we have it before us. Dods (*EGT*) and Plummer (*CGT*) are both serviceable expositions ; the latter is one of the better specimens of the author's work. M'Clymont (*Cent. B.*) has been issued in a revised edition (1922). It is conservative on the critical and historical problems, and a useful aid to the understanding of the Gospel for those who cannot study the larger works.

Westcott published a commentary on the English text in the *Speaker's Commentary*, and for long this was regarded as our standard work. After his death a larger edition was issued, based on the Greek text, and this is much to be preferred. I think it is undeniable, however, that we have drifted a great deal from the attitude towards Westcott which was common thirty years ago. The traditional view as to authorship which Westcott tenaciously held, has been widely abandoned. The Dean of St. Paul's laments Westcott's critical immobility, but speaks of him as 'the one man who among all his contemporaries was best fitted by natural sympathy and understanding to expound the deepest teaching of the Gospel.' He thinks that the more recent commentators, while sounder on the critical problem, had not Westcott's insight into the sublime teaching of John. Other excellent New Testament scholars, however, would demur to this estimate and find much more help for the understanding of the Gospel in some of the recent continental commentaries.

Of these, B. Weiss (*Mey.*) is a favourable specimen of that scholar's work, but the last edition was, I believe, published more than quarter of a century ago. Holtzmann entrusted the revision of his commentary (*HC*) to Walter Bauer, who did the work with great skill and thoroughness. It is one of the best aids from the advanced standpoint to the interpretation of the Gospel. Bauer also did the briefer commentary in *HNT*, which was by no means a mere abbreviation of Holtzmann-Bauer. The second edition of this work which has recently appeared has devoted much attention to Mandæan parallels. I understand that Bultmann is preparing the new edition of John for Meyer. In this we may be sure that great prominence will be given to Mandæan affinities, since the editor has already called special attention to them and put forward a radical theory of primitive Christianity to account for them. The student will be wise to exercise a good deal of caution on this point. Zahn did John as well as Matthew and Luke for his commentary. Heitmüller's contribution to *SNT* is popular and competent.

Wellhausen's *Das Evangelium Johannis* is disappointing when compared with his editions of the Synoptists. It is specially concerned not with the exegesis but with the analysis of the book into its sources. This is a matter for criticism rather than

for interpretation, with which we are specially concerned. This problem has attracted a great deal of attention of late in Great Britain as well as abroad, and of course the documentary analysis has a bearing on the exegesis. In this respect Loisy's career has been of interest. The first edition of his *Le Quatrième Évangile* (1903) was a volume of nine hundred and sixty pages, rather diffusely written and from an advanced standpoint, but a highly competent exposition. The unity of the Gospel was firmly asserted. In 1921 he published a much smaller work devoting about five hundred pages to the Gospel and nearly eighty to the Johannine Epistles. In this revision of the exposition of the Fourth Gospel he has abandoned the unity, and suggests that an earlier draft of the work was expanded by a redactor. He thus applies here a solution with which readers of his works will be familiar elsewhere. The student would probably find more help from the first edition than from the second. I need only mention that an earlier volume by Calmes in the Roman Catholic series of French commentaries has been replaced by an important commentary from the hand of Lagrange.

(*To be continued.*)

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Half-way Folk.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

'Thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot.'—Rev 3^{15}.

In the book *When We Were Very Young*, which every boy and girl ought to know, there is this quaint little song:

Half-way down the stairs
Is a stair
Where I sit.
There isn't any
Other stair
Quite like
It.
I'm not at the bottom,
I'm not at the top;
So this is the stair
Where
I always
Stop.

Half-way up the stairs
Isn't up,
And isn't down.
It isn't in the nursery,
It isn't in the town.
And all sorts of funny thoughts
Run round my head:
'It isn't really
Anywhere!
It's somewhere else
Instead!'

There is a delightful picture of the little boy sitting at the turn of the stairs thinking 'all sorts of funny thoughts.'

Now that's all very well for a little boy on the nursery stairs, but it's not well at all for anybody climbing the ladder of life. But the little boy among his funny thoughts had hit on one thing that is very true; and that is that 'half-way up the stairs isn't really anywhere.'

This world is full of half-way people who think they are doing very well; but they aren't really anywhere. They are like the old woman who bowed her head at the name of the devil and who, when she was told it was at the name of Jesus she should bow, replied, 'I know that fine, but it's as well to have friends on both sides.' She wanted to be on good terms with the Saviour and she didn't want to be on bad terms with the devil, so she sat down half-way between and bowed to both.

In the Gospels Jesus talks about people who try to serve God and gold; about half-Christians who say and don't do. They are not very bad and they are not very good. They are betwixt and between. They are middling. They remind one of the Grand Old Duke of York:

When he was up, he was up,
And when he was down, he was down,
And when he was only half-way up,
He was neither up nor down.

They don't want to be sinners, but they don't want to be saints. They are as near the bottom as the top. They are not anywhere. They are colourless. You can't say what they are, or on what side. You

can't tell whether they are going up or down. They have stopped at the turn.

But I can see this: they are facing downwards, for you can't very well sit on a stair facing upwards; and those people who have sat down about the middle of the stairs of character have their backs turned to the heights, and what is behind our backs is very soon out of our minds. So there they are—stuck fast, hard aground, and quite content.

I see this too, that nobody ever got up to the top by sitting down. If you sit long enough, you fall asleep, and then you fall down and wake at the bottom with sore bones!

In the Old Testament Elijah asked the people of Israel, 'How long will ye halt between two opinions? If the Lord be God, follow Him; but if Baal, follow him.' They wanted to do both and stayed betwixt and between, and God was angry with them.

In the New Testament the Spirit of Jesus says to the Church of Laodicea, 'I know thy works, how thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So now because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth.' That is to say, 'I wish you were something out and out, whatever it is.' Hot water is comforting, cold water is refreshing, but lukewarm water just makes folk sick. People like that, Jesus says, are 'not fit for the kingdom of God.' They are no use. There is no hole to fit them, for they have no shape.

Now the turn of the stairs is a tempting place to sit down. There are turns on the stairs of life that tempt us to sit down. One is when girls and boys are not children any more, and are not yet men and women. It is called 'adolescence'—a difficult word, but it just means the time between childhood and manhood or womanhood. As children they have learned to love God in a child's way, to love Jesus, to like to sing of Him and hear of Him and think of Him. Then just when they should go on some steps higher and stand up on His side, many sit down at the turn, and aren't anywhere, and never get anywhere.

Another turn is called 'middle age,' and there, too, many who have been faithful in work and worship just stop and sit down, and let all their high purposes of following Christ and their hopes of being like Him fade out.

Girls and boys, it won't do. It isn't really anywhere. You can't serve God and gold. People call it 'the golden mean'; but it is very seldom golden, and it is very often mean. Our Saviour says, 'Whosoever is not with me, is against me.' God can save sinners, and can bless saints, but even God is puzzled to make anything of the folk who are neither one thing nor another—the Half-way Folk. They are God's disappointments.

We dare not stop. We must go on and on, and up and up to the top: to full Christian manhood and full Christian womanhood, with Christ and for Christ's sake.

A Challenge.

By the Reverend F. C. Hoggarth, Morecambe.

'Take thy part.'—2 Ti 2^2 (R.V.m.).

The Parks Committee of a certain City Council recently reported a big loss on the year's work. An illuminating analysis was given of the contents of the boxes at the gates. Entrants are given a programme in return for a contribution thrown into the boxes. Much besides money gets into those boxes. All is not coin that rattles. Hundreds of people in a great city are not above coming to hear the best bands that can be procured, and, as their contribution to the expenses, throwing in buttons, safety-pins, nails, boot protectors—anything, in fact, that will rattle.

They might pass the boxes by on the other side. But that would look mean. Besides, they want a programme, which is the hall-mark of their support. With a programme in the hand one is free from any suspicions of having come in without a contribution. So they pass muster, these members of the safety-pin and button brigade. Who pays, so long as they escape, is not their concern. They want the best bands, but any sense of honourable obligation never reaches to the box at the gate.

In the support of the Church we see how unequal the sacrifice is. Side by side with most beautiful loyalty there is found a most heedless lack of that virtue. Some, like Luther, feel themselves part of any situation they are in, others never seem to imagine they are part of any situation. That constitutes one of the greatest differences between people. Some do their part and some don't.

It is a great sort of ideal, this that Paul holds up for young Timothy when he says to him—'Take thy part.' None can begin too early to feel that he is part of any situation in which he finds himself, as a citizen, as a Christian. As such the right sort of person does not seek to be let off lightly. He is willing to take his part, to 'do his bit,' to 'stand his corner.' He recognizes that it is up to him to put at least as much into life as he takes out of it. He knows, too, that such loyalty will mean responsibility, the curbing of his freedom to do always the things he would, and at times real hardship.

During the War a young American officer told the writer that at first he refused the silver bar, the lieutenant's badge. He made excuse. He was not prepared for the responsibility. The straight challenging reply that he got was, 'If you refuse that bar, you're a quitter.' That was how men talked to one another in war-time. He took the bar. War or peace, however, should make little difference. Peace also has its challenges. The challenge of war might never be heard if all good men loyally accepted the challenge of peace. It is more easily possible to be a quitter in peace than in war.

'What are you doing for peace?' asked one ex-officer from a comrade he recently met. 'Nothing,' was the answer. 'Neither am I,' said the questioner. 'We both went through the war. We saw our pals die. But once the fighting is over we do nothing.' Neither of them felt quite comfortable about it. There they were, like thousands of others, doing nothing. Yet the unfulfilled task of Christianity is to organize the world on the basis of brotherhood. That is essentially the task for youth. In the present world-situation, the young should be ambitious to play their part—not seeking to be let off lightly, but eager to share the work that makes God's Kingdom come. Henry Drummond used to say that the first great epoch of the Christian life, after the awe and wonder of its dawn, was when there breaks into the mind the sense that Christ has a purpose for mankind, a purpose beyond us and our needs, which embraces every man and woman born, and their welfare in every part.

Mr. Basil Mathews, in his book *The Clash of Colour*, shows how the boys at Trinity College, Kandy, Ceylon, are learning to take their part.

Boys of all ages from nine to nineteen attend there, they are all shades of colour, from white to dark brown; boys of over a dozen different races. They have a fine sports record, but they are learning that school patriotism is not enough.

They have a Social Service League under which the boys, in co-operation with other people, have helped the poor to fight starvation in the food crises, and have joined in 'clean-up' days to fight the plague. Working with the municipal authorities, they have helped to clear out the filthy nooks and corners of the town, to get the people to destroy their plague-ridden rubbish, and to transfer them from the evacuated plague areas into barracks.

They have arranged for games in the poorer parts and started a play centre for boys; they have run unkempt, neglected boys into Scout Troops and made them keen footballers. They prepared a survey of the need and possibilities of housing to do away with the slums of Kandy, and on their survey subsequent legislation was framed and houses have been built. Whilst still at school these boys are catching something of this take-your-part spirit.

If the Kingdom of God comes but slowly, is it not because of the number of those who shirk their part? Those who are not taking their share too often mar the whole enterprise. Clough's lines are still true:

> If hopes were dupes, fears may be liars;
> It may be in yon smoke concealed
> Your comrades chase e'en now the fliers,
> And, but for you, possess the field.

The Christian Year.

Fifth Sunday after Easter.

The Great Command.

'And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.'—Dt 6^5.

We are all aware that Love to God and Love to Man are the primary principles of the Christian religion and ethic. According to the statement of Jesus, on these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets. The former, at least, is a primary principle of Old Testament, as well as of New Testament, religion. It is true that Jesus deepened love to God and broadened immeasurably love to man; but still in the forefront of pure religion, before Jesus as well as after Him, there stands this precept, 'thou shalt *love* the Lord thy God.'

So far, all is plain sailing; but as soon as we try to make that command concrete, we are faced with difficulties. We find that love to God cannot, any more than love to our friend, be fixed in a formula. It is all the harder to get at the essence of it, because it expresses itself so differently in different natures. St. James and men like him have one way of it. St. Paul and his spiritual brethren have another. Bernard of Clairvaux, Tauler, Eckhart, Madame de Guyon will have their language of mysticism. Horatius Bonar and Samuel Rutherford will have warm, rushing adjectives to describe it. Dr. Dale will say but little, until he has the opportunity of the language of deeds. Yet, all these will have loved their God, and will have been taken to rejoice in His love for ever. Therefore, it is unwise to go outside the scope of Scripture and to attempt more than to state the

origin of this love and some of its indispensable marks.

1. First of all, it has its source in the knowledge that we have of the love of God towards us. 'We love, because he first loved us.' 'Love is of God.' It is the revealed love of God towards us that awakens a like attitude in our hearts towards Him. We gain that revelation in three ways :

(1) In the daily acts of His Providence.

(2) In the sending of Jesus ; and particularly in His death.

(3) In the actual human love of the Man, Christ Jesus. By these various means we are made aware of the permanent God-attitude towards us. When we are awake to it, an answering movement towards Him is expected of us. Thus we are not expected to do more than to have that feeling towards our Heavenly Father which is due to our experience of Him.

From another point of view in Scripture, love to God is based upon the relation which exists between the Perfect and the Imperfect. He is the Perfect. That is to say, He is Love. And His Love is made the basis of an obligation to love Him, on the ground that we ought to love the highest when we see it.

Finally, we learn that love to God is of such a sort that there comes from it, as its child, love to man. You remember how strongly St. John puts the point. 'He that saith he loveth God and loveth not his brother is'—not a half-developed Christian—not a man with an unfortunate disposition—not a man with any excuse whatever—but, 'he is a liar.'

2. When we come to the text itself, what chiefly strikes us is that love is inculcated as a duty. 'Thou *shalt* love the Lord thy God.'

Consequently, we need to take our idea into some region, to begin with, into which compulsion admittedly comes. Now, we admit that we can be commanded to 'love' the good, in the sense of selecting it, desiring it, and pursuing it. Thus, first, we say that Love of God is Love of Good. And we may claim Scriptural support for the view that our love of God is not to be sentiment or excitement of feeling, but is closely connected with wilful moral choice. 'This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments.' In speaking of love to God, we have to remember the peculiar relation in which we stand to Him. The danger of analogies from human friendship is that we come to think of Him as altogether such another as we are. Whereas, we are related to God as we are to no other Being. He is Infinite ; we are finite. He is outside space and time ; all others that we know are conditioned by them. Wherefore, our relation to Him is unique in our experience. So far, the love which we owe to Him is unique also. At the commencement it amounts to a choosing of His side in life ; an acknowledgment of the excellence of, and a surrender to, His will.

So, then, are we to understand the compulsion of the text. But God has so planned our natures that we do not rest there. There is a kind of sequence of experience, which is a spiritual law, which runs like this : strive continually to do good, and you will prefer to do good ; and in the process you will obtain a heart-convincing of God and will recognize Him, not only as Author of the moral law, but as the Heavenly Father. Whence there arises a new consciousness, which enables a man to say, '*my* Heavenly Father.' Then there is awakened in that man warmth of love to God. But that, as a fixed possession, is the reward rather than the commencement.

3. But, in all this, there is a hiatus. For love is not only an outcome of goodness, but an incentive. 'If ye love, ye *will* keep my commandments.' That is a statement of sequences, not a command. It indicates, 'Take care of the loving, and the commandment-keeping will take care of itself.' We all may have seen cases of the effect of friendship on ethical development. As Dr. Martineau says : 'There are cases of minds that out of the thought of self can do nothing ; but, press the lever of their affections, and, though it seems to have nothing whereon to rest, you will move their world.'

Now, that leads many of us into a cul-de-sac. 'Be pure, and ye shall know the love of God.' What is the use of that, if we first need the impulse of the Love in order to be pure ? Ah ! but there is an escape ! How ? Why, through Jesus Christ our Lord. The great Presence is always mediated to us by Christ. And, in the moments when faith is living, there comes a strong, inflexible certainty of a surrounding Christ-love, to which the hearts of us answer with a great rush of trust and security.[1]

Sunday after Ascension.

Intellect and Faith.

'When I thought to know this, it was too painful for me ; until I went into the sanctuary of God.'—Ps $73^{16.\ 17}$.

The poet is here concerned with a problem which only emerged at a relatively late period in the history of Israel. The difficulty of believing

[1] J. R. P. Sclater, *The Enterprise of Life*, 193.

in God's righteous government of the world, in face of the apparent prosperity of the wicked man; and the adversity of the good man, seems not to have pressed itself upon men's minds with any special cogency, until a severe crisis in the national life had made separation between class and class, and tested Jehovah's servants in the glowing furnace of affliction.

In the early and middle days of the Judæan monarchy, when the power of the nation was at its zenith, and men enjoyed, upon the whole, happy and prosperous times, it was the commonly received theory that in this life Jehovah rewarded the righteous and punished the wicked; prosperity was regarded as an immediate mark of His favour; adversity—especially if sudden and overwhelming—as a sure sign of His displeasure. But the period of decadence which preceded the fall of the kingdom of Judah was marked by grave social abuses and growing indifference to the spirit of Jehovah's religion, coupled with bare formalism or the definite introduction of foreign cults. Upright and pious men formed a despised, if not a persecuted, minority; justice and virtue seemed to bring, not success, but loss and failure in their train. And during the Babylonian Exile this condition of things appears rather to have been accentuated than diminished. Nor was the return from Babylon by any means a restoration of happy and prosperous times for this faithful remnant. Though those who availed themselves of the decree of Cyrus belonged, in the main, to the body who held by the hope of Israel, and were, as a whole, animated by a common aim, yet the hardships to be contended with were enormous.

It was in times such as these that men turned to review their ancient position, and to perceive its partiality and insufficiency. Righteousness certainly no longer appeared uniformly to bring its reward, nor wickedness its due punishment. We must recollect that at that stage of thought quick returns were looked for. The view that righteousness would be rewarded after death, and that present hardship might form a training for a future state, so far from being generally held, was, in fact, the outcome of thought which appeared *later on* as part of the answer to the difficulties which the anomalies of the present life excited in men's minds.

> But as for me, my feet were almost gone;
> My steps had well-nigh slipped.
> For I was envious at the arrogant,
> When I saw the prosperity of the wicked.

But even in his misery it comes upon him that this is not the attitude which a member of the true Israel ought to adopt.

> If I had said, I will speak thus;
> Behold, I had dealt treacherously with the generation of thy children.

Therefore, when faith seems weakest, he determines to make the severest trial of faith. He takes his difficulty into the sanctuary of God. And it is here that a solution offers itself to his mind, and he meets with perfect satisfaction.

> When I thought how I might know this,
> It was too painful for me;
> Until I went into the sanctuary of God,
> And considered their latter end.

Let us glance for a moment at the Psalmist's explanation. It is briefly this. The prosperity of the ungodly is, after all, more apparent than real. There is a Nemesis who is waiting in their path. Even while they stretch out their eager hands to gather life's flowers, the solid rock gives way beneath their feet, and they go down quick into the abyss.

Now it must be observed that this solution is not in any sense final and altogether satisfactory. It represents a small advance in thought upon the old opinion; but is, in fact, merely a partial and fragmentary contribution to the truth, and was destined soon to be merged in a larger view of God's dealings with men.

But this is not the Psalmist's real gain during his visit to the sanctuary. We find it rather in that conviction which seizes him of the great reality of his communion with God—a conviction which calls forth from him such a confession of trust in God as forms, when we consider his partial light and uncertain knowledge of the future life, a passage as remarkable and splendid as anything in the pages of the Old Testament.

> Nevertheless I am continually with thee:
> Thou hast holden my right hand.
> Thou shalt guide me with thy counsel,
> And afterward receive me to glory.
> Whom have I in heaven but thee?
> And there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee.
> My flesh and my heart faileth:
> But God is the strength of my heart and my portion for ever.

It has been much questioned whether the Psalmist is here formulating any definite statement of belief in a life of blessedness beyond the grave. This does not seem to be precisely the position which he takes. Rather, in the fullness of the sense of his communion with Jehovah, he ignores or overlooks the fact of death; feeling that he possesses all he needs, and that, in any event, he is entirely in the hands, and under the special care, of his God.

He might have argued that the question was dangerous, as striking at the foundations of belief, and so have determined to preserve his faith by ignoring it. Or, on the other hand, he might have reasoned that, until such a difficulty had been set at rest, belief reposed upon too precarious a basis, and that it was better therefore to suspend his judgment, together with the worship of a God whose dealings with mankind were so mysterious and obscure. He did neither. Rather, while maintaining and exercising his right to rational investigation of the question which harassed his mind, in the light of the facts which lay to his hand, he trusted that beyond this there was something *supernatural* which God alone was able to grant in response to an act of faith; and that this latter, so far from being antagonistic to the results obtained by the exercise of reason, was indeed intended to condition and to set them in a right direction. And so he betook himself to the place where God's mysterious Presence was believed specially to be manifest, and staking all upon an act of faith, he obtained, not merely a rational solution of his difficulty, but, what was of far higher value, such an inward sense of Jehovah's fatherly care and protection as secured him for ever in his faith and endued him with perfect peace.

And this is surely the way in which we ought to meet the doubts and difficulties which so frequently assail us. We are not likely to place them on one side and to ignore them, but we must feel bound to subject them to the searching light which the advancement of knowledge has placed within our reach. Rightly so. But let us not forget that we are members of a Church which believes in and proclaims the supernatural Presence of her Lord in her midst, and that He has promised to give Himself to those who seek Him, in order that He may guide them into all truth. And let us be willing at least to make trial of the act of faith, coming to Him that we may cast our burdens upon Him, and receive for ourselves out of His fullness.[1]

[1] C. F. Burney, *The Gospel in the Old Testament*, 207.

Whitsunday.

The Gift of the Holy Spirit.

'And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.'—Ac 2^4.

1. *The Festival.*—It is something more than history which tells us that Good Friday does not fall in Easter week; it is spiritual necessity which places Good Friday and Easter in a certain order, for, as the Apostle says, 'if we be dead with Christ, we shall also live with him'; or, as the Salvation Army lassie said when she was telling her experience, 'I had to learn that Good Friday came before Easter Day.' The case is not so simple nor the fact so readily observed in the case of another pair of festivals to which we must now draw attention—the Ascension of Christ and the Descent of the Holy Ghost. One does not instinctively connect Ascensiontide and Whitsuntide together. There is a great difference in kind between the two. The former is a festival of heaven, the latter belongs entirely to the experience of the Church on earth. The Ascension was a festival of heaven; it was there that the bells were ringing, not in the most heavenward-reaching of our towers; it was there that they unloosed the bars of massy light and let the King of Glory in; it was the angelic company that had the rapture, who had followed Him all His life through:

> Oft wondering where and how at last
> The mystic scene would end.
>
> They brought His chariot from above
> To bear Him to His throne,
> Spread their triumphant wings and cried,
> 'The glorious work is done!'

In a word, they crowned Him Lord of all; but of the fact of the coronation, in any sense that should provoke a festival record, there does not seem to have been a suspicion in the minds of the primitive believers. And it was not until ten days afterward that the news of heaven became the property of earth, and the saints below began to sing in concert with those that were above and to say that 'God has made this same Jesus both Lord and Christ,' 'He is by the right hand of God exalted; he has received of the Father the promise of the Spirit,' which we now experience. They had linked together the two festivals and made the conjunction of heavenly and terrestrial bliss. It is, therefore, quite clear that these two festivals are a co-ordinated sequence. The Pentecost becomes intelligible when it is seen to be a festival of the exaltêd and glorified Christ.

2. *The Experience.*—So much having been said with regard to the calendar and its external apparatus for the illustration of spiritual things, let us try to get at the spiritual things themselves. The experience of Pentecost is not marked by any other chronology than that of obedience and faith; and these will make a Pentecost anywhere and at any time. Perhaps we shall see this more clearly if we turn to the account of the great and notable day in the Acts of the Apostles; when we do so we find that the stress is laid on time, place, and concord: a day fully come, a place conformed to the habit of an expectant people, and a united spirit of faith. Now, suppose we ask the question, Which of these is the most important, in which quarter did the magic lie, from whence did the grace proceed? From the time? Not necessarily, for the phenomenon repeated itself many times. From the place? No, for it occurred outside Jerusalem, however much it began in and from Jerusalem. From the concord? Certainly this is the mark of every such outpouring and visitation; it is the result of an understanding between God and man and between one man and his brethren. Thus we arrive at the underlying truth that *the day of Pentecost was not a day, but an agreement.*

3. *Its Features.*—And now let us see some of the features which made this visitation of God so great and notable; let us come to the experience itself.

We will speak of it in two of its results: first, as being an equipment in personality; second, as being the reception of the apostolic and Christian credentials.

Now, with regard to personality, may we not say that the Holy Spirit is the missing factor in our personality, and that without it we cannot be altogether ourselves, as God wants us to be? For we notice that an abiding gift means an abiding change in the person to whom the gift is made; and this is an abiding gift: it is said that 'He shall abide with you for ever.' So, then, if the Holy Spirit is a Divine Abiding, the result of the gift will be found in personal equipment and change. To keep the matter simple, and to keep it also forcible, we will call for a testimony as to what the work of the Holy Spirit in the transformation of personality is like. Here is one, of a very simple character.

'Now was I come up in Spirit, through the flaming sword, into the paradise of God. All things were new, and all the creation gave another smell unto me than before, beyond what words can utter. I knew nothing but pureness, innocence, and righteousness; so that I was come up to the state of Adam, which he was in before he fell.'

Now let us think of the way in which this visitation of the Holy Ghost furnishes the credentials for Divine service. St. Ephraem the Syrian tells us that the children of Israel believed Moses when he came down from the mountain because the rays of light from his face furnished a testimony to the truth of his word! It was necessary that Moses should have credentials, for 'whereby shall it be known that thou hast sent me?' the man might ask. So Moses came down from the mountain, supported, not by the conventional two or three witnesses who shall confirm his word, but by two or three thousand convincing and converting sunbeams, declaring without fear of contradiction that 'this man is come to you with a message from your Lord.' The right preaching is that in which something about the man commends the message. And we may say, therefore, that it is of the nature of a true Pentecostal experience to produce *a congruity between the message and the messenger.* Now certainly this was the case with our Lord Himself. The people who heard Him were blessed before ever He opened His mouth and said, 'Blessed are ye.' They were rested before ever He said, 'I will give you rest.' The gospel was Christ even more than it was the word of Christ; and there was a perfect congruity between the Christ-Person and the Christ-word. And this being His experience, we may be sure that something like it appears in the experiences of the apostolic men and women, the earlier and later saints, and believers generally. They have a gospel which has to be proclaimed, but it has also to be commended; it has to be announced, but it has also to be adorned. The Pentecostal congruity between the Messenger and the Message arises from this inward experience, this reign of God in the heart and conscience. And the Holy Ghost will fall on those who hear the word, when it has first fallen upon those who speak the word. It will make them able where they have before been weak; it saves them from impotence, reluctance, and disability. Negatively also it removes from the life those wayward desires which choke the word, impede the life, and postpone the kingdom. Thus the visitation of the Holy Ghost is only another way of describing the effect which Christ has upon willing and surrendered souls: the visitation is, in fact, the vision. It instructs us to follow after Him, and to become fishers of men. It does in continuance what a single visit or interview used to do in the days of His flesh. It is not a different kind of grace from that which came to the woman of Samaria, when a single talk with One who told her all that ever she did made her an evangelist and (may we not say?) an apostle.

And to her also He spoke of an inward fountain

which should spring up into an eternal life; and it would be difficult to describe Pentecost and its experience in more exact terms.

Pentecost adds nothing to the equipment of doctrines: it adds everything to the equipment of the teachers. The equipment of doctrine stands where it did. It is expressed in words like these out of the past of the learners: 'Lord, I believe,' 'Thou art the Christ,' 'He is really risen,' 'Thou knowest all things,' and the like. What, then, is the real increment? A little more faith in the Lord, and a great deal more of resulting experience; a sense of personal union with Him and of personal interest in His grace and His promises; a conviction that the promise is to us which will enable us presently to say to some one else that 'the promise is to you'; a conviction for holiness which will result presently in a confession of holiness, as the Spirit of Truth shall lead.

The right way to understand the difference which the great Visitation made is to imagine what would have happened if they had gone on without it, if they had not tarried in Jerusalem for the Divine equipment. They could have gone on without it; they already were a Church; their names were written both in earth and heaven; they had a message to the world. So they might have made some progress. And perhaps it might not have been altogether unlike the experience of some modern Churches, where they do not preach upon the text, 'The little one shall become a thousand,' but where they discuss whether they are keeping up with the population and its normal growth. In that case Peter might have said to the first believers, 'We are now a hundred and twenty in number, and Christ is risen; perhaps by the end of the year we shall be a hundred and twenty-one.' But what saith the Scripture?—'The same day there were added to the church three thousand souls.' That was the difference. The little one became a thousand under their eyes, and they could see the mustard-seed grow and become a tree as they watched it.[1]

Trinity Sunday.

The Glories of Christ.

'Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and hath made us kings and priests unto God and his Father; to him be glory and dominion for ever and ever.'—Rev $1^{5.6}$.

He 'loves us, and loosed us from our sins in his blood, and made us kings and priests unto God,'

[1] J. Rendel Harris, *Aaron's Breastplate*, 159.

that, in John's view, is the ever-wonderful thing in Jesus Christ, which most clearly marks Him out as worthy to have glory and dominion at all times. Later in his book ($5^{9.10}$), when he imagines what the blessed sing of, he imputes to them no other cause of gladness. Their lives on earth are now completed; they have passed beyond our confusions and see things as they are, but even there they find no grander theme than the redemption wrought by Christ. That other life is the completion and consummation of the present: and as we see men up to the extreme limit of sense still growing in love and wonder for their Lord, we may be sure that they will not forget in that large world which lies before us.

Let us speak, then, of two engrossing wonders—of *what Christ does for men* in loving them, and of *what He makes of men*, in setting them as kings and priests to God.

1. *What Christ does for men.*—John reckoned first that our Master is glorious and worthy of all power, because He loves us and because He died for us. The present tense of the verb, which the Revised Version has restored, has a reality and intimacy which the other reading lacks. That love of His is not of yesterday, but is timeless. It is marked by incidents which have given both life and death another look, and specially by the supreme incident of the Cross; but there is no beginning to the love of Christ, and there can be no ending. We dare not say of any man that there was a time when Jesus Christ did not think of him. Each new arrival on our planet, before ever his eyes have seen the light, has this of wonder hanging round him like a golden haze. Here is a creature coming from God's hand out into a world pervaded by Divine activities. The love of God, as revealed in Jesus Christ, will beset him behind and before, following him over many ways; and one day God will lay His hand upon His child, and awaken him to the sense of the greatest fact of all. 'He loves us'—that is the burden of the song of those whose eyes are opened.

To John this marked the farthest reach of glory in his Master. Throughout the years since first he met with Jesus he had been gathering courage to write that 'God is love,' and nothing made him so conscious of the difference between his Master and the best of men as the Divine largeness of His heart. In our narrowness we draw lines amongst our acquaintances, marking off so many whom we cannot bring ourselves to like. We see nothing in them to admire or to attract; it may be that we even find much to repel. But our

Lord is more magnanimous; and just as a true poet catches hints of the most gorgeous imaginings in places which we find drab and dull, so Christ's thoughts of men are not as our thoughts, nor His ways as our ways.

Sometimes we must be astonished, not so much that Jesus Christ should love men whom we dislike or despise, as that He should love us: looking into our hearts we are impressed by our native ugliness of mood, and we wonder that He is not also repelled. Our lowness of aim, our lack of grace and courtesy, of kindness, and consistency, and chivalry—these make us often odious to ourselves. Anxiously we conceal such faults from our neighbours lest they should condemn us utterly; and yet the Lord from whom nothing is hidden speaks no sentence of exclusion. There are acts and moods which an honest man can scarcely pardon in himself, and yet 'when we were without strength Christ died for the ungodly.' He begins to understand what Ezekiel wrote: 'That thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and never open thy mouth any more, because of thy shame; when I have forgiven thee all that thou hast done.' It was there that many of us, for the first time, saw the full wonder of Christ's greatness, and were ready, with John, to exclaim, Here truly is something high and lordly! Here is One worthy to have the crown! 'To him who loves us be the glory and the rule for ever!'

2. *What Christ makes of men.*—'He loosed us from our sins . . . he made us kings and priests to God.' It is one mark of a born governor of men that he not only can give to noble tools their proper play, but can turn the poorest tools to extraordinary uses. Cromwell spoke with scorn of the kind of recruits who were pressed at first into the Parliamentary army: 'Your troops,' he said to John Hampden, 'are most of them old, decayed serving-men and tapsters and such kind of fellows; do you think that the spirits of such base and mean fellows will ever be able to encounter gentlemen that have honour and courage and resolution in them? You must get men of a spirit that is likely to go as far as gentlemen will go, or else you will be beaten still.' And later he reports that he 'raised such men as had the fear of God before them, and made some conscience of what they did; and from that day forward I must say to you they were never beaten.' That is the record of a famous captain who had the gift of discovering and attaching to himself men who were fit for his work; but how much higher a place would the great Protector deserve if he had been able out of the poor stuff of the old army to fashion such a force as he required, to inspire the battered hearts of its men with his own heroic temper! And that is Christ's continual achievement. His victories are won by men who were not always on His side, and who at first gave little promise of quality. Paul, in one place, runs over a hideous catalogue of offences, and adds, 'And such were some of you; but ye were washed, ye were justified, ye were sanctified'—consecrated to the service of God, and started on the way to sainthood. That is Christ's inimitable work, to lay hold of unsteadfast men for His great occasions and then to make them conquerors. But even that is too weak an expression to describe all that He achieves in those who admit His influence: for Paul has to manufacture a word, and he says that Christ makes us 'conquerors and more.'

'He loosed us from our sins in his blood'—so in life there may be new beginnings, which for those growing old in evil must seem the best of all possible tidings. Christian people so lamentably fail in their thoughts of the new life that they need to be admonished by the confidence of Jesus. To Him His work appeared not as a passing affair, the asserting of a principle, or an exhibition of heroic feeling; He believed and proclaimed that something was actually accomplished by Himself. He who was 'meek and lowly of heart' declared without reserve that 'if he were lifted out from the earth he would draw all men unto him.' On the night of His betrayal He gave them wine, saying, 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood'—what Jeremiah had spoken of six centuries before, and what had remained so long an unfulfilled ideal; but now, said Jesus, it is secured by My death. There is a new relation with God, in which distrust and disobedience have no longer any place, and it is I who have achieved it. In the final hour of darkness, when strength might have been at its lowest, He cried, 'It is finished!'; the work for which the world has been waiting is completed. It would be well for us if we could learn from Christ to think thus decisively of the difference which He has made. When the Pilgrim came to the Cross the burden on his back fell off: 'Then was Christian glad and lightsome, and with a merry heart he said, He hath given me rest by His sorrow, and life by His death. Then he stood still a while to look and wonder, for it was very surprising to him that the sight of the Cross should thus ease him of his burden.'

But Jesus not only separates men from their past of failure, He sets them forward on a new and

glorious course, making them kings and priests to God. Of the two titles kingship has the sound of higher dignity, but priesthood is the more substantial privilege. What everywhere tends to keep men low is their remoteness from God. That binds the cares and miseries of life upon them, for griefs, in other conditions bearable, now fret the soul, whilst graver troubles crush or harden. Men may admit that the anxieties which harass them are disproportioned, but they cannot rise above these, until Christ ends the difficulty by bringing them near to God. He shows them what God is like, and thus inclines them to claim kinship with Him. He takes them by the hand, His utter confidence making them bold, and brings them to the Presence, and He makes them feel that it is part of their duty to be near. 'My remembrance of thee is unceasing,' he says, 'in my prayers night and day.' And thus, with good right, he admonishes his friends to be 'anxious about nothing, but in everything by prayer and supplication with thanksgiving let your requests be made known to God; and the peace of God which passeth all understanding shall keep your heart and mind in Jesus Christ.' That is the priestly rule, where accident and whim are excluded, and 'in everything' approach is made to God; and the end of that rule is peace. It is to this we also are called, for 'he has made us priests to God.'

The kingship follows on the priesthood thus conceived. An old poet had daringly said that God has 'put all things under the feet of man'; but this dominion, if it ever was exercised, has been lost, and we find ourselves enslaved where we were meant to bear rule. But the wrong is set right by Christ, who brings His brethren back to their appointed dignity, making them lords of His own creation. Paul merely translates the promise of kingship into other words when he says that 'all things work together for good to them that love God,' for what before was threatening and hostile is turned about by God to be of service in the growing life. A man to whom every experience thus brings tribute is a true king in the world; he is enthroned where nothing can assail him, for even death itself is his. When love has banished fear, and he knows God as his friend, then all things are on his side. So Christ brings men back to fellowship with God and dominion over circumstance. No wonder that John was moved to exclaim, To Him who can raise a sinful man to such a height of nature, to Him the glory must be due and the dominion for ever and ever.[1]

[1] W. M. Macgregor, *Repentance unto Life*, 176.

The Newer Estimate of Judaism.

By the Reverend R. W. Stewart, B.D., B.Sc., Cambuslang.

At a time when Judaism shows some sign of revising its attitude to Christianity, it is noteworthy that Christian scholars are revising their estimate of Judaism. One of the latest contributions to this process, and probably the most important, is that of Professor G. F. Moore. His two magnificent volumes[1] are the ripe fruit of a mind deeply and widely versed in Rabbinic literature, and have at once been hailed as authoritative and, indeed, as making such books as Schürer's and Bousset's out of date. They are written with utter detachment and impartiality; indeed, with a curious phlegm. For, though the period they cover includes the break-away or emergence of Christianity, the destruction of Jerusalem, and the revolt of Bar Cochba, the volumes can be read from cover to cover without one quickening of the pulse. The explanation is the unreserved adoption of the point of view and horizon of Orthodox Judaism for the purpose of the book, resulting in a surrender, of which the author may be hardly conscious, to its spirit and method. A trifling example is found in the appendix, where the dates of the various Rabbis quoted are given, not, as the eager reader might expect to find them for his modern mind, according to the Christian era—it is of great interest to know the date when the point may be the comparison of Rabbinic and Gospel teaching—but by such a mysterious symbol as P. A. 3, which means Palestinian Amora, third generation. An appendix enables one with cruder thirst for in-

[1] *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; 42s.).

formation to ascertain that this was about A.D. 270–300. It also warns the reader that where index and text do not agree, the index is to be preferred as containing the author's latest judgment.

Orthodox Judaism, according to this authority, really has little history except a quiet academic history which traces not so much the development as the gradual explication of its content. The test of the relevance of events or ideas is whether or not they are mentioned and incorporated in the Talmudic tradition. Judged thus, the birth of Christianity caused no sensation. The sack of Jerusalem is mainly noteworthy in forcing the schools to find new quarters, and Professor Moore seems to establish his case that it really was an academic succession, profoundly learned and diligent, yet hard-shelled to all influences it felt to be external, which founded, preserved, expounded, and handed on the traditional orthodox Judaism which kept the Jewish race distinct, and has dominated its life ever since. It is not unfair to claim that what is to be called Judaism should be determined by the history of Judaism as a whole and in the long run. By this criterion Judaism culminated and defined itself, and has now presented itself to the world for nearly 2000 years in the form which was the result of the labours of the Rabbis called the Tannaim. On all this scholarly toil events made small impact, and to it environment contributed nothing, for it was founded on a revelation essentially complete and explicable from the text of Scripture. Professor Moore protests against the Christian era being taken as if in some way it marked an epoch in Judaism. Much more of a worry to orthodoxy was the claim of the Samaritans, based on some strong Scripture evidence, that Shechem was the true site for the central worship. Greece and Rome, Jesus and Titus, this self-centred academic tradition ignored, yet it constituted the historic Judaism which survived and sustained the scattered people and endures still.

As regards Christianity, from the orthodox point of view it was for long a conventicle within the synagogue, composed of pious Jews,[1] who, since Judaism had no accepted dogma regarding Messiah, were free to maintain if they liked that in Jesus He had appeared, and that He would return to judge the world and inaugurate a golden age. Only when Christians as such refused to join in the Bar Cochba revolt in A.D. 134—for they could not profess to believe in his Messianic claim—did the definite cleavage come between Jewish Christianity and the synagogue.

What, then, was this orthodox Judaism? Fundamental for it was its idea of revelation, namely, that God had of His good pleasure definitely made known His will for men in Scriptures that were thus authoritative and final. We may demur to Professor Moore's dictum that such is the only possible conception of a revealed religion, but it is important to grasp the fact that at least it was the conception of Judaism. Every part of this revelation being Divine and perfect, it required neither supplement nor development, and any seeming new truth was really implied and by adequate exegesis could be discovered in any place in the texts. The Rabbinic exegesis, which often appears mere twiddling, is based on this theory or philosophy; and because there is such a thing as unchanging truth, it does at times with real religious genius succeed. The height to which it soared is seen in Jesus' proof of immortality from the text, 'I am the God of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob.'

This theory, as a whole, is strangely remote from the modern mind which finds a scheme of religious progress and education in the Old Testament. No glimmering of such notions appeared to a Rabbi. His own theory remained tenable to him, partly because the divergencies of views abundantly found in the Old Testament concerned mainly matters of thought and speculation on which dogmatism was not demanded; partly because it was amazing how largely ingenuity could explain away contradictions and discover identities when exegesis was unhampered by rational criticism. And it is to be noted that the theological consequences of this view of Scripture are in Judaism mainly identical with the Puritan or Presbyterian conceptions enshrined in the Westminster Confession. 'Sin is any want of conformity unto or transgression of the law of God.' Only Judaism made no distinction of moral and criminal law. Yet, if revealed religion is necessarily legal, the consequence is that the only remedy for man's case is forgiveness, and this forgiveness is provided for by Divine grace. For that other Shorter Catechism definition of repentance is, with the omission of the reference to Christ, exactly the Rabbinical doctrine. 'Repentance is a saving grace, whereby a sinner out of a true sense of his sin doth with grief and hatred of his sin turn from it unto God with full purpose of, and endeavour after, new obedience.' This grace, according to

[1] 'The first fifteen bishops of Jerusalem were all circumcised Jews.'—GIBBON.

Jewish exegesis, was provided even before creation, for in Ps 90 we read: 'From everlasting to everlasting, thou art God. Thou turnest man to contrition' (thus instead of 'destruction,' A.V.); 'and sayest, Repent, ye children of men.' Grace is not an afterthought; the world was made on a religious pattern, or indeed with a view to religion. 'Man's chief end is to glorify God.' And in the Gospels no new definition of repentance is given, its meaning is assumed to be familiar. What is new is simply the urgency of the call in view of the Messiah's coming.

To the question when Judaism first adopted this theory and became essentially a faith preserved by theological academic tradition and imposed thus in its practical application on an obedient people, the answer has often been, that this was the result of the Exile. The people of a land or sanctuary then became the people of a book. Wellhausen is more cautious than some others in believing that a long time passed before the kernel turned wooden in the shell, and that indeed until Phariseeism prevailed, the freer impulses emanating from the prophets remained active. But against the whole theory that a process of petrifaction set in has to be set the fact that after the Exile and Ezra came such writings as Job and Psalm 139. What really happened was rather a direct and logical development of prophetic teaching in the light of practical conditions. The starting-point is Jeremiah's individualizing of religion carried through with relentless logic by Ezekiel. This involved the spiritualizing of the whole idea of repentance, and indeed the coining of a vocabulary to express this, together with the cultivation of a scrupulous conscience regarding personal obedience. Religion became altogether a personal relation between man and God; though this personal relation was to be attained in fellowship with others and membership of the nation. This is the real development, and it is complete already in the Psalms. In fact, apart from the question of immortality, orthodox Judaism shows little change after 200 B.C., which was several generations before the dominance of Phariseeism.

This spiritualizing of repentance and insistence on personal responsibility fitted in with the character of the synagogue. That new institution, with its discipline of prayer and study, replaced the temple cultus so largely for practical purposes in the living consciousness of Judaism, that the question which suggests itself at the destruction of Jerusalem is not, 'How did Judaism survive the shock?' but 'Did Judaism feel any shock?' Indeed, the first real shock that Judaism has had to meet is that which is to-day shaking its very foundations, namely, the application of the idea of evolution to revelation. Christianity, with its doctrine of the spirit, is tolerant of this modern philosophy, or rather is in accord with it. But the idea drives a wedge between Orthodox Judaism and all the modern liberal Jewish movements, which really tend more and more towards a unitarian Christianity.

For the Christian theologian, two questions arise from this presentation of Judaism. One is, whether the Christian movement was conscious of any vital difference between its own attitude and that of the schools to the study of the traditional revelation. To this the answer must be a simple negative. Christ's answer to the Sadducees about marriage in the age to come, and His proof of immortality, His extension of the meaning of neighbour in the parable of the Good Samaritan, like Paul's appeal to the story of Hagar, were on the current line of interpretation. Paul's criticism of Judaism was not that it had been mistaken, but that it was superseded. The retort of Jews to Christian exegesis was not to attack any changed method of interpretation, but to issue a revised version of the *LXX*, Aquila's translation, which cut away certain textual bases for their argument.

The other question is, how far to accept the demonstration in these pages that the familiar contrast between law and grace, as the distinguishing marks of Judaism and Christianity, is false or at least exaggerated. It might have to be conceded that Professor Moore not only can take a longer, wider survey of Judaism, but may know it as thoroughly as, or more thoroughly than, Paul; for printed books and critical editions are a tremendous aid to study. On the other hand, Paul was not only a genius but a competent Rabbinical scholar by the standard of his day, and he lived within the system, and his evidence is to the effect that he felt the contrast to be vital.

According to Professor Moore, as against Paul, righteousness in Judaism is not a perfection which it recognized as obviously impossible, and was of course recognized by God as impossible when He made this world, but is obedience to law (including what is available of the sacrificial system Divinely provided) coupled with repentance. The question is begged when Jewish piety is called 'legalism,' it might rather be called 'loyalty.' For, while meticulous definition is given of matters that can be defined, such as tithes and ceremonies, other matters are expressly referred to vaguely, as committed to the heart, and the pious man is loyal to

the core in both divisions of the field, making no presumptuous assumptions, that anything can be dismissed as a mere 'external.' A lot in the world to come, even if assured of a Jew by race, is assured by the election of his race through free grace; and, even when a reward of good works is hoped for, it is a graciously promised reward, not a payment earned.

Yet the Pauline antithesis of law and grace is echoed in the Fourth Gospel—'the law came by Moses, grace and truth came by Jesus Christ'; and, if the Pauline Luke's report is not regarded as coloured by later reflexion, it is found in Peter's utterance—'the law that neither we nor our fathers were able to bear.' Far more important, and indeed overweighing all that can be adduced to show Jesus as holding steadfastly to the Law, is the great saying reported of Him: 'Come unto me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and learn of me, for my yoke is easy, and my burden light.' It is difficult to deny a reference here to the scribes and Pharisees, who bound heavy burdens on the shoulders of the people, to which they themselves, hypocrites, would not put a finger. Even if the saying has not this special controversial edge, it does imply a contrast between Jesus' yoke and every other rule of life; and that nearest to hand was certainly the Pharisaic interpretation of the Law. Here, at least, the criticism of the Pharisees suggested is not merely the hypocrisy of the teachers but the burdensomeness of the system.

All this, however, hardly gets beyond the circle of literary criticism. Christianity is certainly not defined by a compendium of its tenets or maxims; and, if orthodox Judaism can thus be exhibited, Judaism was also manifested in cruder popular forms which were less gracious; and there must have been a larger Judaism which was in mutually felt hostility to Christianity and was not in complacent isolation from all influences of environment and events. Professor Moore passes over the hostility felt to proselytes. At various points in his book one is on the brink of discovering such a wider interest, when one is told shortly to draw back one's eyes from matters which lay outside orthodox Judaism. Can we dismiss apocalyptic, which emerged in such voluminous form, as no more important than for Christianity are the views of modern millenarians? Can we believe that the admittedly enormously successful mission to the Greek world through the Dispersion produced as little repercussion in Jewish thought as the Talmud suggests? And, above all, is it possible that the radical nature of the break-away which left Judaism high and dry was undetected and unresented in its earlier stages and indeed for nearly 100 years?

On more than one point it is probable that the conclusion pressed home with such mastery of material must be unreservedly accepted, and some of the easy and familiar contrasts often drawn between Christianity and Judaism will have to go by the board. The idea of the Fatherhood of God was common in Jewish thought, and in Rabbinic teaching was brought out of the background in which it lay in prophecy and made prominent. The fact that apocalyptic imagery makes God remotely transcendent is simply a necessity of its pictorial method, not a contribution to theology. Besides the idea of Fatherhood, a precious element in Judaism is the prophetic idea of the personality of God, that is integral and dominating in the conception of God's unity. Judaism arrived at monotheism not by reflecting on the need for one creator of the physical world or of a unifying metaphysical principle, but by the moral implications of faith in God's will and purpose and character.

On the question of the Jewish attitude to its mission to the nations, Professor Moore would abandon the use of abstract terms like 'nationalism' and 'universalism,' as suggesting considerations outside the range of Jewish thought. For prophecy and Judaism the Law was always ideally conceived as universal in its scope, and the Kingdom of God, the universal acceptance of the law, meant the unlimited extension of Jewish nationality. Always the Jewish mission aimed at incorporating converts—proselytes—into the Jewish race; thus its idea was at once universal and national. This was the natural outlook when the final hope took the form of an earthly Paradise. And Judaism never revised it to meet the demand we feel to be made on thought by the more spiritual eschatology of the belief in immortality and a new age.

If some of the dividing lines one had thought to see between Christianity and Judaism are thus blotted or blurred, the result is to confirm the notion that it was not in the earthly ministry of Jesus or immediately thereafter that Christianity attained clear consciousness of its own new principles. And if it is demonstrated that the differentia are not what some have taught—even in the N.T.—the fact remains that there was a difference, and we are left to find it at other points, in faith in Christ, and the guidance of the Spirit. Jesus crucified must be related, as Stephen and Paul saw, not merely to Judaism, but to God and the world, and communion with God through Christ displaces

the letter of the Law. Even if we surrender Paul's antithesis of law and grace, he was right through and through in insisting that in Christianity was universalism in an absolute sense and that the law both moral and ceremonial was set aside in favour of the law of liberty, the mind of Christ. Universal Jewish nationality was a narrow and illusory hope. The Kingdom of God abolishes frontiers, and makes Christ the centre, not of triumphant Judaism, but of humanity.

Three in One, One in Three: A Study.

By the Reverend William Ross, B.D., Edinburgh.

Creeds, Confessions, Catechisms, Compendiums of theology are all human and therefore fallible. At the best they are crystallizations of the thought of their own time, not of all time. Of these compendiums of theology known to us, however, for brevity and yet comprehensiveness, for logical sequence of thought and literary grace of expression, few stand higher than the Shorter Catechism of the Westminster Divines. In that Catechism, the following definition is given: 'There are three Persons in the Godhead; Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory.'

To my mind, remembering the crucible of criticism through which this definition has passed in recent years, with the single exception of the word 'Person,' for which I would substitute the word 'Personality,' there is no definition of the Trinity that can be substituted for it. Definition, however, is one thing, intelligibility is another. The question we now face is this: Is this definition rational, intelligible, credible, or is it, as some say, a contradiction in terms? I take an orange or an apple, and divide it in three parts, and I say that each of these parts is contained in the other two, or that the whole is contained in each of the parts, and I speak nonsense. My words are a contradiction in terms. When I say that Godhead consists of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Three Personalities in One, One in Three, am I speaking nonsense, am I perpetrating the same contradiction in terms?

Now in the first place, definitely and dogmatically, every material analogy to the Trinity is futile and fallacious, and necessarily so. It cannot be otherwise, because God is spirit only, and the categories of spirit and matter are different, different in being and in thought, and the laws of these two are not only different, but in some respects opposite. One illustration. It is a story about Thomas Carlyle. The origin of the story I do not know, and I cannot vouch for the truth of it, but it comes from so many quarters that it must be true about him or some other. It is so inept as to be ridiculous, but it serves my purpose, and can be quoted without irreverence. Carlyle one day conversed with a minister, and the subject of conversation was the Trinity. Carlyle had difficulty about it, and the two men parted with mutual dissatisfaction. Next day they met on the highway, and at that moment a gig with three people in it passed them. Now ministers may be stupid like other people, but this one must have been more stupid than the average, for he said, 'There is the very thing we spoke of yesterday which you said was impossible—three in one, three men in one gig.' The answer was obvious, and it came in a flash, 'Yes, but when did you see one person in three gigs?' Dogmatically and emphatically, every material illustration of the Trinity must be futile and fallacious.

Now I desire to say, audacious as it may seem, that for many years the Trinity has not presented to me an intellectual difficulty; that, if rightly viewed, it is not a contradiction in terms, but on the contrary the doctrine is rational, intelligible, credible, satisfying to mind and heart. There are three avenues along which this doctrine may be approached, two of them avenues of reason, argument, illustration, and the third the avenue of revelation and the experience by which it is proved to be true.

1. The first avenue is the difference between the laws of matter and spirit, and especially in the law of division. Let me illustrate. An ounce of concrete illustration is often worth a ton of abstract reasoning. I take a material object, a sum of money, for example, and I divide it into two parts. I give away one part. The portion I retain is, of course, less by the amount given away. That law holds good for all material things. The portion retained is less by what is given. The law of

spiritual division is the opposite. Courage is a spiritual thing, the first and noblest of the virtues. A company of men on a battlefield are ordered to take a redoubt. The task is difficult and dangerous. It means death for some, if not for all. The men are human, and a wave of fear passes over them. They pale and shrink from the task. The only man who preserves his equanimity and courage is a young officer. By his words, and still more by his dauntless bearing, he imparts his courage to the whole company. His courage is not lessened by what he gives; on the contrary, it is increased. Faith is spiritual. You believe in God with your whole heart. You believe in Jesus Christ and worship Him. Through that faith you believe in yourself and in life generally, in what Robert Louis Stevenson calls 'the ultimate decency of things.' You meet some one who has lost faith in everything. By your words, and still more by your life, you have the inexpressible happiness of sharing your faith with them. Your own faith is not lessened thereby; on the contrary, it is indefinitely increased. Love is spiritual. You love God with your whole heart. You love father or mother or child with your whole heart; you have still the whole of your love that you can give to another.

Now the argument is this—Personality is a spiritual entity. It is spiritual in each of its component parts—in thought, feeling, will, conscience, and in that self-consciousness in which personality finds its crown. In its sum total it is spiritual. It conforms, therefore, to the laws of spiritual things; it can be given away and yet retained. Now human life in everything is imperfect, and a perfect example of personality given and yet retained can hardly be found. But analogies can be found so close that the perfect example may be readily imagined. A father and son (I knew one case) are alike in physical appearance—in form and feature, in stature and gait; they are alike also in mind and in feeling, in the outlook and the atmosphere of their life, so much alike that they seem like two editions of the same book with a different date. The son's personality was impressionable like wax; the father's was like a seal, and the seal rested on the wax for many years, with the result that seal and stamp could hardly be distinguished. Perfect reproduction of personality in human life is not found, but the likeness may be so nearly perfect that a case can be imagined in which it is perfect, and the son may truly say, 'To see me is to see my father; my father and I are really one.'

The Lord our God is one God. The unity of the Godhead is the central basal truth of our faith, a truth that must be guarded from the taint of compromise. Mohammed might have been a Christian but for the perverted form in which Christianity was presented to him by the heretical sects by which he was surrounded. 'Christians,' he said, 'worship three gods—God and Jesus Christ and the Virgin Mary.' Christianity, he meant, was plurality of gods, and he was right. The worship of the Virgin is beyond question polytheism. But when Jesus speaks of one God only, and tells us that His Being finds expression in three personalities equally Divine, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, is there any contradiction there, any difficulty in receiving and believing that revelation? To my mind there is none.

2. The second avenue of approach to the Trinity is along the three ultimate units of reality. In the application of this argument to Transcendence and Immanence, a powerful statement of it is found in Streeter's book, *Adventure: The Faith of Science and the Science of Faith*, in a chapter on Religious Objectivity, by Mr. MacMurray. Here is the argument: There are three ultimate units of reality. The first is Inorganic, dead matter. That unit may be called mathematical; a stone is such a unit. To increase that stone you add another to it, a multiplicity of stones is a heap. The second unit of reality is Organic; it is biological. It possesses life. It is higher by a whole kingdom than the first. Life has the power of growth. A plant is such a unit. It grows in bulk, in height or in breadth, or both. The third unit, the highest we know, is Personality. The peculiar attribute of personality is Transcendence; transcendence above the rest of Nature, but transcendence also above itself, that strange power by which we can stand out of and above ourselves, by which ourself is the object of our thought, while we are the subject thinking, by which we can admire ourselves, or look a little closer and find precious little to admire; transcendence also above the personalities of others, by which we can enter into their personalities, and think their thoughts and act their part in the world. In other words, Transcendence also connotes Immanence.

The most transcendent personality in our race was that of William Shakespeare. What a mind was his; *facile princeps*, the greatest this world has known. How marvellous his power of entering into other personalities, real or imaginary. Now he is Antonio, the Merchant of Venice, so free and generous, so gracious, lending his money without interest, and so incurring the deadly hatred of the money-lender; now he is Shylock, whetting his

knife to cut his pound of flesh from the spot nearest Antonio's heart. Now he is King Richard III., tormented by conscience; and again he is Sir John Falstaff, the rollicking roué with no conscience at all. Now he is Hamlet, meditating deep on the present and the future; and now he is a grave-digger, philosophizing on the skulls he unearths in the graveyard. Now he is the wisest of men, and again he is a clown fooling on the stage. What infinite variety of character that marvellous mind was immanent in. The greater the transcendence of the mind, the greater also its power of immanence. Is it not along this avenue that the clue and the key are to be found to the seemingly incompatible truths of the transcendence and the immanence of God? Infinite Transcendence, Infinite Immanence, that is God.

But one thing must be remembered. God is present in everything, but only in the measure in which He can be contained in it. In a real sense God is present in a clod of earth, and it is only now that the secrets of Divinity in that clod are being discovered—its miracles of matter, its atoms, its ions, and its electrons. In a higher degree—far higher—He is present in a plant, for the plant is alive. Higher still, He is present in human personality, for man is made in the image of God. He is a miniature of Godhead, if he only believe it and live it; but Jesus tells us that there are three Personalities in the Universe in which alone the whole of Godhead can be contained. Is there aught of contradiction in that, aught, indeed, that is difficult to believe?

3. The third avenue of approach to the doctrine of the Trinity is the teaching of the New Testament, and the experience of one's own soul. In Jesus Christ we have come to know God as Father, as Creator, the Maker of our mortal bodies, the Father of our immortal souls, the Giver of every good and perfect gift. In Jesus Christ we have come to know God as Son, the Revealer of God, the Saviour of mankind. In Jesus Christ we have come to know God as the Holy Spirit, the Comforter, the Guide, the Teacher who leads us into all truth. To know God thus is to have a rock on which faith can be rested, certain that it never can be moved. 'I believe in God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost, one God.'

Contributions and Comments.

A New Witness for a Famous Western Reading.

Readers of The Expository Times will be interested in an addition to their textual apparatus in Ac 6^{15}, in which a Western reading comes to light from an unexpected quarter, this time with geographical accuracy.

I have been lately reading the Life of St. Kentigern in Capgrave's *Nova Legenda Angliæ*. One of the first things that struck me was the fact that the hagiographer was a scholar and had a library; he makes his saint quote one of the *Similitudes* of Hermas, the one about the Elm and the Vine; he does not indeed mention Hermas by name, but there can be no doubt as to the source from which his reference is taken. We need not assume that it was Kentigern who had been reading Hermas; that would be to take legend too seriously; but we must at least allow that his would-be biographer had access to the *Shepherd*. It was interesting to find that the book had found its way to the British Isles, and I was so pleased with the discovery that I sent a note on it to The Expository Times for March. On reading further in Capgrave's text, we are told that St. Kentigern was at times so exercised in prolonged and intense prayer that his face was, as it were, on fire; the bystanders who looked on him saw his face as it had been the face of an angel standing in their midst.[1] Here there is an evident reference to the appearance of the face of Stephen when he was on trial before the Sanhedrin, and it is a reference made by way of a Western text, for it contains one of the famous Western glosses in the text of the Acts, the interpretation of which is still one of the leading problems before the textual critic.

First of all we transcribe the sentences from the *Life of Kentigern*:

> 'Intuebantur enim faciem eius tanquam vultum angeli *stantis inter illos*,'

where the last three words constitute the well-known gloss to which we refer. Now let us look at the text as it stands in the Codex Bezæ, Ac 6^{15}; the Greek is:

> και ατενιζον δε αυτω παντες
> οι καθημενοι εν τω συνεδριω

[1] *Nova Legenda Angliæ* (ed. Horstmann), ii. 121.

και ειδον το προσωπον αυτου
ωσει προσωπον αγγελου
εστωτος εν μεσω αυτων,

and the corresponding Latin is :

et *intuiti* in eum omnes
qui sedebant in concilio
et uiderunt *faciem eius*
quasi faciem *angeli*
stans in medio eorum,

where we have italicised the words which are closely related to the passage in Kentigern. There is not the least doubt that the writer of the legends has a glossed text of the Acts. In the same passage we may compare the reading of the Fleury text :

et cum *intueretur* eum omnes
(qui er)ant in concilio, videbant
vultū eius tamquā (*vultum*)
angeli dī *stantis inter illos,*

where again we italicise the coincidences with the Kentigern text.

To the foregoing we must add the evidences of the Irish MS., known as the *Leabbar Breac* or *Speckled Book* :

uidebant faciem angeli
stantis inter illos,

where again we have the gloss in close agreement with Kentigern.

Readers of my *Four Lectures on the Western Text,* published thirty-four years since, will find a discussion of the origin of this gloss. The latest reference to it is in the text of the Acts as published by Professor Ropes, as follows :

'J. R. Harris, *Four Lectures on the Western Text,* pp. 70–74, argues that the rendering of *d stans in medio eorum* points to a text in which this related to the high priest and belonged to the following sentence (cf. Mk. xiv. 60); in reply see *Corssen, Götting gel Anzeigen,* 1896, pp. 434 f.'

Professor Ropes does not say whether the reply is convincing. Our readers may like to look into the matter for themselves. Meanwhile we make them a present of the new authority.

One further observation with regard to the evidence for this gloss in the text of the Acts. We ought to have before long a careful review of the revised edition of Nestle's Greek Testament, which has been brought out by his son, Dr. Erwin Nestle, and is not only a monument of filial piety but a real contribution to the study of the New Testament. It makes a genuine advance, both in the additional matters that are attached to the text, and in those useless references to previous editors and the like which are now abandoned. A hearty welcome, then, to the new Nestle.

If we look at the critical apparatus of the text as Erwin Nestle presents it, we shall find that on Ac 6^{15} the gloss which we have been discussing is credited to the Codex Bezæ (D) and to two Latin authorities, marked *h* and *t*. The reference is obscure. Usually *h* means something to do with the text of Hort, but here, I suppose, it means the Fleury text. But what is *t*? Apparently no explanation is given of the abbreviation. So we are left to conjecture. Is it the text of the *Liber Comicus?* Yes! and the *t* stands for Toledo, from which this missal comes.

J. Rendel Harris.

Birmingham.

Berākah.

The Arabic word *baraka* often means a good deal more than is conveyed by the common translation 'blessing.' Dr. Edward Westermarck in his book, *The Moorish Conception of Holiness* (*Baraka*), and elsewhere, has pointed out that among the Arabs of Morocco the word ' is used to denote a mysterious wonder-working force which is looked upon as a blessing from God, a " blessed virtue." ' He thinks it may conveniently be translated into English by the word 'holiness.' As Professor Elliot Smith has remarked, this is not at all a suitable translation. Indeed, it is so difficult to find a suitable equivalent in English, that Dr. Westermarck himself commonly uses the Arabic word *baraka* without attempting to translate it. People like 'holy men' or 'saints' possess this *baraka* in an exceptional degree. It is possessed also by certain sacred places; by certain animals; by certain mountains, rocks, stones, springs, trees; and by certain vegetables, fruits, and herbs. It is possessed even by certain names, such as Muhammad.

It is the purpose of this note to suggest that the Hebrew noun *berākah* and the verb *bārak* (in the Pi'el, Niph'al, and Hithpa'el particularly) often have the same kind of connotation. And here again it is difficult to find suitable translations. The translations 'blessing,' 'bless,' 'bless themselves' are not suitable. The only way out of the difficulty, therefore, is again to retain the foreign expression and to speak of *berākah.* In Is 65^{8}, for instance, we read in R.V.: 'Thus saith the Lord, as the new wine is found in the cluster, and one saith, Destroy it not, for a blessing is in it, so

will I do for my servants' sakes, that I may not destroy them all.' But 'blessing' is surely a tame translation. It would be better to render, 'Destroy it not, for there is *berākah* in it.'

Let me illustrate the suitability of this interpretation by translating some other Old Testament passages. The forms *bērēk*, *nibrak*, and *hithbārēk* I translate 'give' or 'ascribe *berākah*' to and 'get *berākah*.' Thus in Gn 1^{22} we read, 'And God gave *berākah* to them, saying, Be fruitful and fertile, and fill the waters in the seas, and let the fowls be fertile in the land.' In Gn 2^{3}, 'And God gave *berākah* to the seventh day and made it holy, because in it he rested from all his work which God had framed to do.' In Gn 18^{18}, 'And Abraham shall become a great and powerful nation, and through him shall all nations of the earth get *berākah* (Niphʿal).' In Gn 26^{4}, 'And I will make thy seed abundant like the stars of the sky, and I will give to thy seed all these lands, and through thy seed shall all nations of the earth get *berākah* (Hithpaʿel).' In Gn 27^{27}, 'And he drew near and kissed him and whiffed the whiff of his clothes, and gave him *berākah* and said, See, the whiff of my son is as the whiff of a field to which Yahweh has given *berākah*.' In Gn $28^{3f.}$, 'And may El Shaddai give thee *berākah*, and make thee fruitful and fertile, so that thou become a concourse of peoples. And may he give to thee the *berākah* of Abraham, etc.' In Gn 39^{5}, 'And Yahweh gave *berākah* to the house of the Egyptian on account of Joseph, and the *berākah* of Yahweh was in all that he had in the house and in the field.' In Ex 23^{25}, 'And ye shall serve Yahweh your God, and he will give *berākah* to your bread and your water, and I will remove sickness from your midst.' In Nu 6^{27}, 'And they shall put my name upon the children of Israel, and I will give them *berākah*.' In Dt 7^{13}, 'And he will love thee, and give thee *berākah*, and will make thee fertile, and will give *berākah* to the fruit of thy belly and the fruit of thy ground, thy corn, and thy wine and thy oil,' etc.

The word seems often to have the same significance in the Psalms. In Ps 100^{4} we read, 'Give thanks to him, ascribe *berākah* to his name.' In Ps 96^{2}, 'Sing to the Lord, ascribe *berākah* to his name, proclaim from day to day his power (*yeshuʿātho*).' In Ps 132^{15}, 'I will give *berākah* to her provisions, her poor I will satisfy with bread.' In Ps 133^{3}, 'Like Hermon-dew which flows down upon the mountains of Zion; for there Yahweh commanded the *berākah*—life for ever.' In Ps 145^{1}, 'I will exalt thee, my God, the King, and will ascribe *berākah* to thy name for ever and ever.'

I submit that *berākah* in Hebrew, like *baraka* in Arabic and *mana* among the Melanesians, denotes often a magical or wonder-working power, and that the essential significance of the term is not properly indicated by the translation 'blessing.'

MAURICE A. CANNEY.

The University, Manchester.

An Emendation of Psalm lxxii. 7.

HERE the Hebrew, as the text now stands, when viewed as an example of parallelism, must be relegated to the ranks of 'corrupt readings,' with Cheyne's condemnation, 'No poet would have written this.' Not even by the greatest stretch of exegetical imagination can any satisfactory parallelism be said to exist between the words 'men' and 'princes'; neither does this verse, when the introductory word אָבֵן is rendered by our 'but,' at all harmonize with what has gone before. Yet by a simple emendation of the Hebrew text, the alteration of a single letter, more or less perfect parallelism is restored; and, when אָבֵן is taken in its other sense, namely, as a strong asseverative, this verse is found to be in complete harmony with the preceding one. If, instead of אָדָם 'man,' אדר (אַדִּיר) 'magnificent' is read, vv.$^{6.7}$ will then run as follows:

'I have said, Ye are gods: and ye are all the children of the most Highest.'

'*Surely* ye shall die like *the magnificent*, and fall like one of the princes.'

W. H. A. LEAROYD.

St. John's College, Durham.

Entre Nous.

Sincerity.

When Lord Charnwood wrote his study of the origin and character of the Gospel according to St. John, he was drawn to add a postscript discussing not the origin of the creed but its truth, telling frankly what he himself really thought about religion. This epilogue attracted perhaps more attention than the work itself, and it is not to be wondered at that Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have thought well to publish it in the form of a little book. The title is *A Personal Conviction* (2s. 6d.).

'I start, more or less at random, from an observation which happens to have forced itself upon me long ago, regardless of such principles as I should probably have then professed. Towards any great man, alive or dead, except our Lord, the attitude of discipleship is unreasonable and unmanly; towards our Lord, as from a simple reading of the Gospel we all more or less conceive of Him, some sort of unaffected discipleship appears, as we go on in life, the only reasonable or manly attitude. . . . Some people, though they would shrink from putting the fact into words, would have to confess that they never get through their ordinary course of duty efficiently, except in a temper which is kept alive in them by the constantly renewed resolve of very humble discipleship to Him.'

The first certain fact, then, to Lord Charnwood is that men have had so far but one Master. The second is that He revealed the one Gospel that they could ever have. After a section on Sin and the Atonement—though the sense of Sin has been obscured to many people with repetition, he does not believe that it has been lost—he passes to the mystery of pain and to the mental processes that lead men to Christianity.

'The religious apprehension comes, first, not as an assertion but as a command. Christ does not come to you and me saying, "I am the Christ." Without explanation He says, "Do likewise." "Get up and walk." His promise of a fuller light that we shall walk in lies behind.'

To the question, 'What is the *First* Duty,' Lord Charnwood answers: 'It is to be sincere towards yourself and the world. Only, since after all you are probably going to let yourself off something on the ground of sincerity, be quite thorough with the sincerity. It is not at all easy. Perhaps this simple reminder is better than any analysis of the very obvious ways in which humbug and cowardice may take one to church or keep one away, or in which fidgety minds may skip or torpid minds drift to one conclusion or its opposite.'

'But I believe it is in every way helpful to recall that Christ demands sincerity. It is helpful, amongst other ways, in preventing that agony of religious questioning (attempting to force one's belief and never succeeding) to which more people than we suspect may be prone, but which surely is not God's desire. This demand of sincerity is a fact about Christ's religion which modern study reads quite clear in the Bible. And it is one of the dark stains on the history of all Churches for many centuries now that not only ecclesiastics, but congregations and crowds of Christians, have so often been the enemies of any fearless quest of truth or any straightforward telling of it. Even now many preachers and their congregations speak just as if conformity instead of truth could lawfully be made the primary aim. It would not be fair to say this without adding that the exact parallel holds good in politics, and in other walks of life—conceivably even in some scientific pursuits. The fact is, that it is harder and more unusual than we sometimes recognize for men to value truth as such very highly. That hard and unusual thing Christ demands. It would be slightly inaccurate to say that it was His primary demand, because life must not be artificially simplified by picking out some one element in the right life and putting it alone. But, along with some other things, honest facing of fact was an essential part of the childlike simplicity and singleness of heart which was His primary demand.'

A Sense of Sin.

'Nobody can be healthily alive without having often tingled with impotent rage against himself for some thing that he has done. Of course this self-anger is often most unforgettable when it relates to some quite trivial awkwardness, and a man will almost blush half a century later about some boyish absurdity which he knows had its creditable side. Yet it is not true to say that we forgive ourselves our graver lapses, our actually foul acts, or perhaps fouler omissions. These are things of which, the truth is, we hardly dare think, and doubtless, though it is good for us sometimes to face them steadily, it would not be good for us to think often of them. So far as we do think of them, they are worse in our eyes than they would

be in the eyes of our friends or of our enemies either; it is no comfort to know that other people do equally despicable things; and the excuse of circumstances, temperament, etc., which we would willingly make for other people's faults, would be the worst mortification of our self-esteem if we made it for ourselves. This is, I am sure, the normal way of thinking for healthy minds, and it is not made much less so by the appalling ease with which we may lose this way of thinking in regard to the particular kind of fault which has become habitual to us.' [1]

Women and Holy Orders.

Canon Raven has just published a book which he is well aware will arouse fierce criticism. But there is a constraint upon him which brooks no refusal—to make his plea to the Church of England to admit women to Holy Orders on an equality with men. The volume is entitled *Women and Holy Orders* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net). It is a persuasive book, full of careful reasoning, which merits widespread consideration. The most important chapter is the fourth, in which Canon Raven examines the argument from Scripture. For the admission of women is to him a matter of theological principle even more than of justice and expediency. Our Lord, he says, did not discriminate in His treatment of men and women. 'He horrifies His apostles by speaking to the woman of Samaria, and His host by permitting the woman who was a sinner to anoint His feet. He has women in the company of His disciples and accepts their ministry.' 'In him,' as Saint Paul declares, 'there is neither male nor female: we are all one.'

But what of Christ's silence—of the fact, first, that He nowhere establishes the ordination of women; and second, that He did not choose a woman as an apostle. The former fact, Canon Raven says, 'is scarcely relevant, for He never mentions either deacons or priests, or, indeed, any of the details of Church organisation. Here, as always He came, not to lay down a code, but to sow seeds that would live and grow and bear fruit.' Again, to use the argument that He did not choose a woman as an apostle is 'fatally to misconceive the whole purpose of the Apostolate. Apostles were missioners, chosen and sent to a particular service. And to select a woman for such a task would have been at once unjust to her and practically futile. . . . It does not follow that because such work was impracticable for a woman in the first century, she is to be debarred from any authorised ministry for all time.'

Turning from the Gospels to the Epistles of Saint Paul, Canon Raven argues that in the passages in which the Apostle reaches his full stature, he, like his Master, sees all distinctions of sex and race, of class and culture done away with in the new age. When he is dealing, however, with more practical questions, he is less free from Judaism. 'Corinth, whose sacred prostitutes in the temple of Aphrodite gave their city's name to all women of loose life, was the place above all others at which scandal was most to be expected. There was bad trouble in the Church already: the town was full of women accustomed to identify religion with sensuality: the Christian community set great store by emotional excitement.' It was natural, then, that Saint Paul in the First Epistle to the Corinthians should declare that 'women must not speak' in the meetings.

After examining the directions in the Epistle of Timothy in some detail, Canon Raven says, even if it is possible 'to collect a few texts which imply that in the Apostolic age the exigencies of the time made it impossible to secure the full and immediate realisation of the Kingdom of God upon earth, the whole tenor of the New Testament is plainly against any final adherence to the subjection of half the human race.'

In the first century, immorality was open and general, and it was in such a depraved world that Jesus proclaimed the Sermon on the Mount, and committed the task to His disciples of so permeating human life by His spirit that gradually the conventions and resistences of men should be overcome, and all things be made new. The little Church of Jerusalem soon learned that if it was to survive, it must be prepared to grow slowly, and so we find them giving sanction to temporary arrangements, but if we mistake these for 'the eternal principles of the Gospel of Jesus, we shall wholly misconceive the character of Christianity and shall make of it a mechanism, not a way of life.'

[1] Lord Charnwood, *A Personal Conviction*, 26.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

The preacher is exposed to two temptations: the first is that of seeing too much in his text, the other is that of seeing too little. The historical method sharpens his intellectual conscience. He will shrink, if he be honest, from preaching on the coming of Christ from Haggai's prophecy, as given in the Authorized Version, that 'the desire of all nations shall come,' when he discovers, as he may from the Revised Version, that the reference is to the silver and gold, the 'desirable things,' which are to stream from all nations into the temple of the Lord in the days to which the prophet looks forward.

But while there is the real danger of misinterpreting, by unwarrantably enlarging, the original meaning of his text, there is the equal danger of unwarrantably limiting it. The men who wrote the Bible, we may be sure, saw deep into the essence and mystery of life, and few things are more astonishing than the large and almost illimitable meaning to which their simple words lend themselves, when we learn the art of giving them the earnest consideration to which they are entitled.

As we read, for example, through the brief tale of Isaac as told in Gn 26, we light upon one of those simple verses which seem at first to have no more than historical value: it is this—'Isaac's servants digged in the valley, and found there a well of springing water.' This is one of the verses to which the preacher is apt to do less than justice. He can read it and pass on, without observing that in it there may be a well of refreshing water for himself. A glance at the Hebrew, or—if his Hebrew be far to seek—at the margin either of the Authorized or the Revised Version, will reveal to him that the 'springing water' of the text is 'living water' in the original; and, if he have the preacher's eye for a homiletic hint, his heart will leap, with the same sort of thrill as Isaac's servants experienced when they came upon the living water, as he observes the close connexion between digging and life. It was the man who dug who reached the living water.

There are parts of Palestine refreshed the long fierce summer through by springs and copious fountains, and there are other parts where springs are few, and men who needed water had to dig for it. Child of the promise as he was, Isaac had to face the practical problem of finding water for thirsty men and cattle. In part he was heir to his father's wells; for the rest, he must dig for the water he needs till he finds it. How the eyes of the diggers would gleam as, almost like a human thing, the fresh, kindly water leaped up to welcome them! Living water for living men, for men who will steadily and bravely cut their way through all difficulty and impediment to the refreshment without which their souls languish as in a thirsty land.

And is not Palestine, with her hills and her

valleys, her dry places and her wells, the mirror of all human experience? Sometimes a thirsty tract of our own life is blessed by wells which we have not dug. We have all fallen heir to wells which our fathers have dug for us. But there are other tracts on which our fathers can do nothing for us, and we shall perish of thirst if we will not ourselves dig down till we reach the living water.

The clear cool water is not to be had for the wishing, but for the digging. With faith in the ground beneath our feet we must dig down and down till the sweat stands upon our brow. Thus and thus only can we reach the water, and only thus do we deserve it. This treasure, like many another, is hidden, and will only reveal itself to the man who bends his back to dig for it.

If genius is rare, industry, the capacity for taking infinite pains, is nearly as rare. That is why so many lives are insipid. They are not refreshed by living waters, because there has been no digging. We will do nothing more than scratch the surface of our experience; most often, not even that. We stand lazily upon it, without piercing through it to the thing that would refresh us. We forget that, if we descend to the depths, He is there. From thoughtlessness or indifference, we will not descend into the meaning and purpose of the passing days, and so we remain unrefreshed. There is no living water for the man who will not dig.

All this has its special application to the preacher. Pressed by the weight of many engagements and cares, from some of which at least a wise congregation would, even for its own sake, readily release him, he loses the student's habit. He reads what little he has time to read, but he does not study; he skims the surface, forgetting that the secrets are hidden in the depths. Of all books the Bible is the one which is most dishonoured by superficial study. Much of it, let us be thankful, is plain enough: in the Psalms and in the Gospels there is food for the simplest and most unlearned souls. But much —let us confess the truth—is difficult enough, much, too, that it is of the highest importance to know. He is a clever man indeed who completely understands the Prophets or the Epistles on the first, or even the twentieth, perusal.

Literature like this is not to be grasped by skimming over it, and even the more seemingly simple books will yield their richest treasure only to the man who will dig for it. But when we find ourselves content to move airily across their chapters, we should pause and assure ourselves that deep down are living waters, and brace ourselves to the patient search without which those waters cannot truly be ours. Surface meanings are for idle souls; the more patiently and prayerfully we search the depths, the more surely and abundantly shall we find that well of water which springeth up into everlasting life.

One of Christ's parables pillories for all time a man who said, 'I cannot dig.' And it is no accident that this man was a dishonest knave, who had wasted his master's goods and was destitute of any sense of stewardship. Ashamed to beg and unable to dig—what a sorry fate! and not least sorry for the preacher. He is indeed not always ashamed to beg, or at least to borrow. He sometimes plunders shamelessly enough the resources accumulated by the patient toil of other men; but he can never make them, in any proper sense, his own, until he has learned something of the intellectual and moral discipline by which those from whom he borrowed have acquired them.

So it comes back to this, that the preacher who would reach the living water that he may present it to the thirsty lips of others, must learn the art of digging. He must recover the lost habit of real study. He must take the time or make the time. It is never competent to him to say, 'I cannot dig.' He can, if he will; and why should any man of us refuse to dig whose hope is sustained by the promise of the Lord that he that seeketh findeth?

It can hardly be denied that the disciples' belief in the resurrection of Jesus played a vital part in the formation and development of the Christian

Church. But for the 'Resurrection-faith,' the Christian Church would probably, or almost certainly, not have come into being; and the interpretation of the 'Resurrection-faith' has largely determined the history of Christian thought. A Christian creed ending with 'crucified, dead, and buried' is practically inconceivable.

There may, however, be a real distinction between the Easter faith and the Easter message. It may be one thing to believe in the resurrection of Jesus, another thing to accept the narratives of the Resurrection as they have been handed down to us, through apostle and evangelist. Even so essentially conservative a critic as Dr. E. G. Selwyn can say: 'While the Christian creed asserts an unequivocal belief in the fact of our Lord's resurrection, it lays down nothing as *de fide* in regard to the manner of it; and on the latter point many different interpretations have been given by theologians of unquestioned orthodoxy at different times.'

The late Principal Denney went the length of saying that the manifestations of the Risen Saviour which created the Christian Church and the New Testament retain their original certainty even under the supposition that we can 'make nothing whatever of the testimony of the evangelists'—although he was himself far from asserting the need of contemplating a supposition so extreme. Yet he suggests that Luke's tendency to 'materialize' the supernatural has left traces on his narrative of the Resurrection, in which the Risen Lord is represented as eating, an idea 'not only incongruous but repellent.'

As the conviction that Jesus still lived may have led Luke to materialize the Resurrection stories, so it may be held to have suggested the further belief in the empty tomb. Thus a distinction may be made, within the distinction between the Easter faith and the Easter message, between the personal existence and activity of Jesus after His death and the reanimation of His dead body. There can be little doubt that the Resurrection in the first sense is essential to the Christian faith. But it may be maintained, as for example by Mr. Bevan, that the truth of the continued activity of Jesus does not seem to depend on whether the body taken down from the Cross was reanimated or not.

This position is supported in a recent essay by the Rev. C. J. Cadoux, M.A., D.D., on *The Resurrection and Second Advent of Jesus* (Independent Press, Memorial Hall, London; 1s. net), in which two main statements are made and defended. The first, that by 'rising from the dead on the third day,' Jesus meant precisely the same as 'coming on the clouds in great power and glory,' does not immediately concern us in this Note. The second statement is that 'Jesus after His death manifested Himself to individual disciples and groups of disciples, not with the physical flesh of His body raised out of the tomb, but in the manner obscurely suggested by various psychical experiences recorded in later times.'

This statement, we may remark, catches up the teaching of Dr. Kirsopp Lake in 'Resurrection.' We may also remark that Dr. Cadoux has not found space within the limits of his essay to indicate the 'psychical experiences' which are in view. But what we chiefly want to say is this, that while the 'objective-vision theory' may be offensive to many Christian believers, it has also proved helpful to many, enabling them to make their subscription to the historic Christian faith. They cannot identify in their minds the Easter faith and the Easter message, and yet they cannot abandon the Easter faith in favour of some 'subjective-vision theory' such as Schmiedel's. The distinction here involved between 'objective' and 'subjective' may not be altogether happy, but it is one in which apparently the mind may rest.

Every new interpretation of the life of Jesus has to deal with the Temptation, because that is a crucial point on which all the rest hangs. Many of the 'modern' constructions come to grief at this obstacle. Dr. Warschauer, for example, in his 'Historical Life' of Jesus, endeavours to make out

that Jesus shared the belief of His time about the coming of the Kingdom of God. But the Gospel accounts of the Temptation show that this idea is a fallacy. The inner significance of the Temptation is that Jesus met this current conception of the Kingdom at the outset of His career, considered it, weighed it, and rejected it.

In the impressive little book, reviewed in another column, *Jesus as I see Him*, by Johannes MÜLLER, there is an attractive exposition of the Temptation. The author begins, of course, with the experience of Jesus at the Baptism. 'That he was expressing directly at every minute the divine life of God now for the first time became a fact of which he was aware. This sudden realisation at baptism radically altered his consciousness, took root and unfolded itself in his mind, and became human experience . . . He felt compelled to face and fulfil this extraordinary new position, and the tumult within him urged him into the loneliness of the desert . . . For, as soon as a personal experience emerges from the region of divine immediacy and is intellectually grasped, the race mind with its individual personal bias asserts itself. Then it is that there arises the possibility of misunderstanding and distortion, of the outlook becoming dimmed and discoloured.'

This is how the Temptation arose. The more the Divine call to bring in the Kingdom of God echoed through His soul, the more persistent became the thought: how can it be brought about? There flashed before Him the possibilities, the ways and means that present themselves usually to the human mind. For the three temptations represent the three ways in which men, even up to the present day, think they will bring in the Kingdom of God.

The first temptation is the thought of bringing about a new order by the alleviation of hardship or evil, through changing the conditions and multiplying the necessaries of life. To-day the parallel is the effort to solve the social problem, for example, by destroying capitalism. Jesus' answer was that the Kingdom comes in a different way, that man's salvation has its source not in earthly reform but in the creative act of God. 'Nothing but the action of God can redeem and transform humanity. Corruption and misery are not healed by reforms, and nothing fundamental is wrought by culture. World-renewal comes through God's life germinating and growing.'

The second temptation (the Pinnacle of the Temple) is one to win the masses by sensational means. But to Jesus it was clear that the Kingdom was to come 'in a secret, simple, and casual way.' He never dreamed of undertaking anything in His own strength. To 'tempt God' is to launch out on a task in the foolhardiness of our erring human knowledge and desire, and presume that God will make it successful; to depend on 'answers to prayer' and extraordinary efforts, instead of realizing that God is to do everything in His own quiet way. Everything is foreseen, shaped, achieved by Him. And His will is our way.

In the third temptation is the old assurance that the Kingdom can be built up by the very factors that have produced the old world order, by 'new views of ethics,' by culture, by politics, by laws, ideals, art, and science—all applied by the help of logic, pedagogics, suggestive mental treatment, and all the rest! But to Jesus all this was nothing. God has a power which is not of these things. We cannot organize the Kingdom into existence. Jesus rejected everything that savoured of the world and its method. 'All human thought or skill is not merely a useless specific, but a deadly poison. For the Kingdom of God is diametrically opposed to the system of the world, and to everything that the human mind produces, the tools with which it works, the things that it fabricates.' To human judgment it is irrational, unthinkable, impossible, but it is true.

These thoughts of Jesus were soon lost by His disciples. Christendom succumbed to the temptations that Jesus resisted, not only in the desert, but inflexibly throughout His whole life. From the human point of view Jesus and His activities were insane. No one understood Him then, and it is

difficult for us to see Him aright even now. And we shall never really understand Him until we realize that what happened at His temptation was the secret of His whole life—everything of God, God and His ways the one sole object of faith and acceptance as life and guidance, as end and means.

Such is Jesus at His temptation as this writer 'sees Him.' The same truth was once put in a memorable way by a preacher of exceptional insight and gifts. He put the three temptations in three pithy phrases. The first: 'Necessity knows no law.' The second: 'Faith knows no law.' The third: 'Success knows no law.' To the first Jesus said: 'The one necessity is God's law.' To the second He said: 'Faith accepts God's way.' To the third He said: 'The real success is to be at one with God.'

Commentaries on the Old and New Testaments.[1]

By Professor Arthur S. Peake, D.D., Manchester.

IV.

Eduard Meyer has recently emphasized the view that Luke and Acts are not two distinct works by the same author, but the first and second parts of a single work. This position has been strongly enforced by Cadbury in his *Making of Luke–Acts*. It is accordingly interesting that the two have been constantly treated apart and by different writers. If Luke is taken in combination with other books it is with Mark and Matthew, not with Acts. For this their place in the Canon is partly responsible. It was natural that the force of gravitation should detach Luke from Acts and bring it into the corpus of the Gospels. It is regrettable that the long-promised edition of Acts in *ICC* by C. H. Turner, with whom Bate has since been associated, has not yet appeared. Our most comprehensive commentary is by Knowling (*EGT*), now nearly thirty years old. It was, indeed, too full, taking account of many things of an ephemeral character. But it was a very thorough piece of work. Rackham's contribution to *West. C.*, which occupies a distinct place of its own, was also fuller than the normal limits of the series permitted. A new edition in *CGT* has been for many years overdue. I might mention a rather more elementary school edition by Burnside. It displays a fairly good knowledge of modern literature in English or Latin. Bartlet (*Cent. B.*) is fresh and suggestive; a new edition of this brought up to date would be welcome. In the new series entitled *The Clarendon Bible*, A. W. F. Blunt has written an interesting volume on Acts which is attractively produced and copiously illustrated. He has done Galatians in the same series. A larger commentary on the English text of Acts by Furneaux may also be mentioned.

A very comprehensive work on Acts is designed when complete to form the first part of *The Beginnings of Christianity*, edited by Foakes-Jackson and Lake. The first volume dealt with the background and does not concern us. The second volume consisted of a considerable number of studies, dealing specially with the criticism of Acts, contributed by various writers. The third volume contained a most comprehensive and very important study of the text by Ropes. The fourth volume, which is in the press, is to contain a translation and commentary.

There are several important German works. Wendt (*Mey.*) is learned and sober, one of the best expositions available. Preuschen (*HNT*) appeared almost simultaneously with the last edition of Wendt. It also was a solid contribution, though more extreme. Norden's *Agnostos Theos* could be taken account of in the preface to both commentaries; had it appeared earlier it would presumably

[1] I use ICC for *International Critical Commentary*, CB for *Cambridge Bible*, Cent. B. for *Century Bible*, West. C. for *Westminster Commentaries*, EGT for *Expositor's Greek Testament*, HC for *Handcommentar zum Neuen Testament*, HK for *Handkommentar zum alten Testament*, HNT for Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament*, KHC for *Kurzer Handcommentar zum Alten Testament*, Mey. for Meyer's *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, SNT for J. Weiss's *Die Schriften des Neuen Testaments*, ZK for Zahn's *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*.

have influenced them more deeply. Zahn wrote a massive commentary in his own series. No recent edition of Holtzmann (*HC*) has been produced. Knopf, who gained his reputation by an excellent work on the Post-Apostolic Age, and who completed J. Weiss's *Urchristentum* and wrote a serviceable *Einführung in das Neue Testament*, contributed the commentary to *SNT*. A notable Latin commentary was written by Blass, the famous Greek scholar, in 1895. This attracted a great deal of attention not only from the freshness and independence of the notes, but by its theory that Luke himself prepared two editions of his work.

In the French Roman Catholic series Jacquier wrote an enormous volume of more than eleven hundred pages in rather small print (1926). It naturally contains a large mass of valuable matter. At the other extreme we have Loisy's nine hundred and fifty pages. Loisy's theory is that Luke wrote a history which went down to the death of Paul. The date was about A.D. 80. Some forty years later a Roman Presbyter took this work, which was as honest as one could expect such a book to be, and by extensive mutilation, distortion, and invention of innumerable fictions created our present book. This extreme scepticism, which has gone from bad to worse in later volumes, especially in his commentary on Luke, greatly reduces the value of his work. The reasons alleged for his negative results are often so flimsy, arbitrary, and subjective that they could be dictated only by the resolute will to disbelieve. How flimsy they are may be illustrated by his statement that 1 Co 13 has every chance of not being the authentic work of Paul. There is no reason for this except that it seems to interrupt the connexion between chs. 12 and 14; but this would only warrant the suspicion that it was out of place (so J. Weiss). But it must have been written in connexion with the topic of spiritual gifts which Paul is discussing in chs. 12 and 14, and therefore must have been written for that discussion. No one writing an independent panegyric on love would begin, 'Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels,' and proceed to speak of gifts of prophecy and knowledge, and revert to this theme later in the chapter if the subject in connexion with which it was written had not been that of spiritual gifts. In other words, the chapter arises directly out of the discussion in which it is found and is indissolubly connected with it. This wantonness of hypercriticism is abundantly illustrated in most of Loisy's recent work. It is a real tragedy that knowledge so wide and intellect so acute should be controlled by a scepticism so unreasonable.

I pass on now to the commentaries on the Pauline Epistles. For Romans we have Sanday and Headlam (*ICC*). This is valuable for its philology and textual criticism; the exegesis takes account of the best literature, ancient and modern, British and foreign. I doubt, however, whether a partnership is in the nature of the case suitable for the exposition of a work like the Epistle to the Romans, and the special qualifications of Sanday would, I think, have found a more appropriate field for exercise in the Acts of the Apostles than the Romans. Sanday's gift lay much more in the critical and historical than in the speculative and theological field. For this, Denney, who edited the Epistle for the *EGT*, had much more natural aptitude, and he was also an excellent scholar. While his work had admirable qualities, it was marred, in my judgment, by certain limitations, on which my own controversy with him turned. He had a strong dislike and deep distrust of mysticism. This led him to deny that Paul affirmed a mystical union of the believer with Christ, and intended only a moral union. Nor could he attach any meaning to racial acts, as predicated of Adam and Christ. What Denney saw he saw clearly and sharply and expressed with pungency and power. What he could not see did not exist, and he listened rather disrespectfully if you reported that you had really seen it. Good Paulinist though he was over a large part of the field, one part of it, and that which for Paul himself was central, lay outside the range of his vision.

In the *Cambridge Greek Testament* the general editor, St. John Parry, has produced a volume which will be found very serviceable by those who do not possess the larger commentaries, but which should not be neglected by those who have access to them. Garvie, in the *Century Bible*, is in close agreement with Sanday and Headlam in its exegesis, and the interest of the author in the philosophic aspects of theology is an additional qualification for a writer on Romans. I should like to mention an older book, Liddon's *Explanatory Analysis of the Epistle to the Romans*; its exegesis, where theological questions did not intervene, was substantially that of Meyer, but the author's skill in presentation is seen to advantage in the notes, which constitute the main part of the work. The Commentary by Pallis is written from an eccentric standpoint. The author regards the Epistle as not genuine and as greatly interpolated, but there are interesting suggestions on the text and inter-

pretation, and on questions of philology the author has a right to be heard. He has also issued notes on Mark and Matthew, on John and the Apocalypse, and on Luke and Acts.

Of foreign commentaries I need not linger on B. Weiss and Zahn. One of the best is Lipsius in *HC*. The author was not only a very accomplished New Testament and patristic scholar, he was also a distinguished theologian. An untechnical treatment of great merit is given by Jülicher, one of our foremost New Testament scholars in *SNT*. Lietzmann has reserved for himself the commentaries in *HNT* on Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians. New editions of these valuable works would be welcome. An independent commentary by Kühl is of unusual excellence. Barth's famous exposition scarcely falls within the scope of these articles.

On 1 Corinthians, A. Robertson had promised to write in *ICC*, but the greater part of the work was done by Plummer. It is a solid contribution to the subject, but on it and the commentary on the Second Epistle wholly written by Plummer, who edited it also for *CGT*, more need not be said. G. G. Findlay in *EGT* is marked by real distinction and is one of our best English commentaries. Massie (*Cent. B.*) is chiefly notable for its exegetical paraphrases which seem to me models of their kind. He deals with both Epistles, and his Introduction to the second is a good guide through the tangled critical and historical problems. Goudge has commented on both Epistles in *West. C.* I have not yet seen the second volume. The first is a careful work, but written with definite presuppositions as to the type of Christianity which the apostle takes for granted.

In German, Schmiedel has written on both Epistles in *HC*, a work of exceptional ability. Bachmann's treatment of both in *ZK* is also very thorough. Bousset's exposition in *SNT* is a worthy companion of Jülicher's Romans. But the outstanding Commentary on 1 Corinthians is J. Weiss (*Mey.*), in no sense a revision of the old Meyer, but an entirely new work, one of the very best commentaries that New Testament exegesis has produced in our time. It is distressing that he could not prepare for publication his commentary on the Second Epistle.

On 2 Corinthians, Bernard (*EGT*) is good so far as it goes, but disappointing in its brevity. Menzies has written an independent commentary, fresh and valuable, like his work on Mark. Both scholars hold to the unity of the Epistle, a view which to many scholars, Harnack now included, seems more than dubious. The place left vacant by the death of J. Weiss has been filled by Windisch, a competent and widely read scholar.

With Galatians we come to Lightfoot. It is convenient to mention at this point that in 1895 Lightfoot's trustees published a substantial volume containing notes on the whole of Thessalonians, on 1 Co 1–7 and Ro 1–7. These were based upon his lecture notes and contribute much of value. In addition there is a commentary on Eph 1^{1-14}, which he had prepared for publication as part of his projected edition of that Epistle. The commentaries which Lightfoot published were on Galatians, Philippians, Colossians, and Philemon. There is a well-known verdict of Hort's that the commentaries are characterized by masculine good sense, without the insight or delusion of subtlety. They are learned, lucid, and balanced. The paraphrases are exceptionally good. There are valuable studies of words; they are strong on the historical side, and there is a welcome sanity in the criticism. But the defect at which Hort gently hinted was there, as any one would discover, who worked through Lightfoot's *Colossians*, side by side with Erich Haupt's edition. The commentaries contain valuable dissertations later collected in a convenient form in *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*. When these and the introductions are subtracted, the space actually allotted to the exegesis is not excessive, sometimes perhaps, scarcely adequate.

On Galatians our most comprehensive work is Burton (*ICC*). A valuable appendix dealing with special terms covers about a hundred and sixty pages. Rendall (*EGT*) is characterized by finished scholarship and freshness, but it is a drawback that the editor gives no reference to other expositors. Lukyn Williams in *CGT* is compact and excellent; and Adeney has a useful little work in *Cent. B.* Emmet in *The Reader's Commentary* is brief but very good; and there is a fresh and able brief commentary by Bacon. Ramsay's *Historical Commentary* is half devoted to a valuable historic introduction, and the rest of the book is not a commentary in the usual sense, but it is indispensable to the student of the Epistle.

In German I believe there has been nothing to replace Sieffert, in *Meyer*. On Schmiedel (*HC*), Bousset (*SNT*), Lietzmann (*HNT*), and Zahn (*ZK*) I need add nothing. In French, commentaries have been written by Loisy and Lagrange.

The imprisonment Epistles (Ephesians, Colossians, Philemon, Philippians) are not generally taken together in British series, the attractive little volume, by Currie Martin (*Cent. B.*), forming an exception. In German series it is more usual.

The outstanding commentary here is that by Erich Haupt, alike for its close grappling with the thought, the tenacity with which it follows up the development of the argument, and the subtlety and skill which it displays in the detailed exposition. P. Ewald (*ZK*) is an excellent work of the same type, but scarcely, I think, of the same calibre. Lueken (*SNT*) is a useful popular exposition. He contributes the section on Thessalonians also. Martin Dibelius, one of the ablest of the younger scholars, has done Thessalonians and the Pastoral Epistles, in addition to the imprisonment Epistles, for *HNT*. For *HC*, Lipsius commented on Philippians, leaving Ephesians, Colossians, and Philemon for Von Soden, whose work reaches a high level, here and elsewhere, though scarcely, I think, equal to that of some of his colleagues.

In the *ICC*, T. K. Abbott gave to Ephesians and Colossians a mainly philological treatment, frequently critical of Lightfoot's results. It is disappointing because pre-eminently in these Epistles thought rather than philology demands the first place. Marvin Vincent was responsible for Philippians and Philemon. It is a careful rather than a distinguished piece of work. In *CGT*, Dr. J. O. F. Murray has dealt with Ephesians in a full, thorough, and independent way; and Dr. Lukyn Williams' edition of Colossians and Philemon is a worthy companion to his Galatians. Our fullest exposition of Ephesians is given by Salmond in *EGT*. It takes account of all the preceding exegetical work and is perhaps overburdened with matter. The edition by J. Armitage Robinson follows an unusual arrangement. There is a long continuous exposition based upon an English translation (mainly A.V.), followed by the Greek text with a commentary, largely philological, to which a series of detached notes is added constituting the main contribution made by the volume. British commentaries, apart from Abbott, have been deliberately neglected; but the commentary would have gained if the best foreign work had been taken into account. Westcott's posthumous notes have been edited with great care and competence by J. M. Schulhof. It remains to mention that H. A. A. Kennedy's treatment of Philippians in *EGT* reaches an exceptionally high level, and that a good commentary has been written on it in *West. C.* by Maurice Jones. Colossians in *EGT* was done by myself, and Philemon by Oesterley.

On Thessalonians there are several good commentaries. In addition to Lightfoot's *Notes* already mentioned, we have a full and careful study by Frame (*ICC*); Findlay in *CGT*, compact and within its limits first-rate; a good popular treatment by Adeney (*Cent. B.*); Moffatt's exposition in *EGT*, which we could wish had been much fuller; and G. Milligan's comprehensive commentary, which is specially rich on the philological side. Of German commentaries Bornemann (*Mey.*) retains its value for its elaborate history of the interpretation of the Epistle, but otherwise it has been superseded by Von Dobschütz's full and valuable edition. Schmiedel has undertaken it for *HC*, and I have already mentioned Lueken and Dibelius for *SNT* and *HNT* respectively. Wohlenberg wrote on the Epistles in *ZK*.

On the Pastoral Epistles we have at last the long-anticipated volume by Lock (*ICC*). Bernard in *CGT* is full and good, and there is a careful and fairly long exposition by N. J. D. White in *EGT*. Brown (*West. C.*) has an interest of its own from the light cast on the Epistles by the editor's work in India. R. F. Horton has contributed an interesting popular exposition to *Cent. B.* R. St. John Parry's *The Pastoral Epistles* consists mainly of an introduction defending the conservative position, but it contains the Greek Text with fairly full annotations at the end. Liddon's explanatory analysis of 1 Timothy might also be mentioned, as for Romans. In German I believe that B. Weiss has not yet been replaced in *Mey.* Von Soden (*HC*) is one of the best German expositions. F. Koehler has written in *SNT*, Wohlenberg in *ZK*, and Dibelius in *HNT*.

Our most recent commentary on Hebrews is Moffatt's (*ICC*). Characteristically full knowledge of the relevant literature, a wide range of reading and first-hand research combine to make it a very important contribution to the interpretation of the Epistle. Nairne's *Epistle of Priesthood* included an exposition of the Epistle, but his commentary proper is to be found in *CGT*. It is written on original lines with a long history of the interpretation and an elaborate discussion of the theology. It is learned and fresh, much too advanced for schoolboys and at times rather intangible. But it is a real and valuable contribution to the literature on the Epistle. Dods contributed to *EGT* a full and thorough commentary exhibiting great width of reading in the exegetical literature. Wickham's *Hebrews* seems to me one of the less favourable specimens of *West. C.* Westcott's has commonly been regarded as our best British commentary, but though I am sorry to dissent from Nairne's weighty judgment, I can only record the very definite impression I formed when writing my own commentary in *Cent. B.*, that Davidson's little book had

behind it a stronger mind and a more penetrating insight into the meaning of the writer.

Turning to German works, I must break away from my rule, to mention the great commentary by Bleek which introduced a fresh era in New Testament exegesis, has deeply influenced later commentators (*e.g.* Westcott), and has not lost its value. B. Weiss (*Mey.*) is not, I think, at his best on this Epistle, nor is Von Soden (*HC*). Riggenbach (*ZK*) is probably the best of the recent commentaries, and on a smaller scale Windisch (*HNT*). The Epistle has been undertaken by Hollmann in *SNT*.

The General Epistles are not usually taken together in English series, but W. H. Bennett has treated them excellently in a single volume of *Cent. B.* Windisch has dealt with all in *HNT*. Hollmann and Bousset with all except 1 Peter in *SNT*.

On James we have a very comprehensive and learned treatment by J. B. Mayor. Care should be taken to procure the third edition (1910), along with the pamphlet *Further Studies in the Epistle of St. James*, with special reference to Hort's edition (1^1–4^7). Hort also edited 1 P 1^1–2^{17}. These editions are of exceptional value. In *ICC* we have a recent and admirable commentary by Ropes. Oesterley in *EGT* should not be neglected; the author's Rabbinical studies give a distinctive value to his notes. Knowling, who was unusually well equipped with knowledge of the foreign literature, has written on James in *West. C.* In German we have Beyschlag (*Mey.*), now old but not superseded, Von Soden (*HC*), and, as already mentioned, Hollmann and Windisch.

1 Peter has been combined with 2 Peter and Jude by Bigg in a fresh and original commentary written to some extent from a wrong point of view. J. H. A. Hart edited 1 Peter for *EGT*. The special quality of his commentary is its use of the Septuagint and Jewish literature. In *CGT* G. W. Blenkin has written a useful exposition, and there is a good independent edition by Masterman. In German, 1 Peter, 2 Peter, and Jude have been taken by Von Soden in *HC*, by Wohlenberg in *ZK*, and by Knopf, an excellent scholar prematurely taken from us, in *Mey.* Gunkel (*SNT*) is, of course, important. On 2 Peter and Jude, J. B. Mayor has given us a volume which is a worthy companion to his edition of James. Rather curiously he has also edited Jude for *EGT*. 2 Peter has been undertaken for that commentary by R. H. Strachan, who has written a very full Introduction. The two Epistles are edited for *CGT* by the expert hand of M. R. James. Here, again, the Introduction is elaborate in comparison with the notes.

On the Johannine Epistles, Brooke in *ICC* is excellent. D. Smith in *EGT* reveals, but on too limited a scale, the well-known qualities of his work. Plummer is responsible for the volume in *CGT*. The best-known commentary containing much valuable matter is by Westcott. Of German commentaries, in addition to those already mentioned, I should name Holtzmann-Bauer (*HC*), which is among the best available, and Baumgarten (*SNT*). G. G. Findlay's exposition, *Fellowship in the Life Eternal*, though not technically a commentary, calls for mention here.

On the Revelation of John there is a considerable literature. Charles (*ICC*) has behind it the editor's great and fruitful labours on the apocalyptic literature. He has devoted immense pains to establishing the text of the book, and he has made a study of its language of unprecedented thoroughness. He has also spent a great deal of study on the work of his predecessors. His theory of the stupid editor who arranged the closing sections in wrong order and at other points defaced the master's work is suggestive, but so far as I have observed has not met with acceptance. Moffatt in *EGT* is fresh, learned, and generally excellent. Simcox (*CGT*) ought to be replaced as soon as possible. Anderson Scott (*Cent. B.*) now lies in a rather distant past. It was admirable when published, and is still useful; we wish the editor could adjust it to the present situation. Swete is very good on the textual and philological side; his exegesis is marred by his compromise with allegorical interpretations where it is improbable that these were intended by the author. Hort left a valuable fragment on chs. 1–3, with an introduction to the whole book. There is an American commentary of solid merit by Beckwith. The latter half of my Hartley lecture on the Revelation of John is devoted to an exposition of the book. In German the fullest of our recent commentaries is the second edition of Bousset (*Mey.*); though issued more than twenty years ago, it is still valuable. Holtzmann-Bauer (*HC*) is, of course, excellent but briefer. Zahn has recently completed his great commentary (*ZK*) written from a conservative standpoint. J. Weiss had his own views of the literary history of the book which he published in a monograph in the *Forschungen*, edited by Bousset and Gunkel. He contributed the commentary to *SNT*, of which he was the editor, but for the last edition this has been edited by Heitmüller. Heitmüller should have written on Revelation for *SNT*; but owing

to his premature death the task was undertaken by Lohmeyer, whose commentary is among the most striking contributions made to the study of the book. He takes it to be a unity constructed with the highest art. While denying the apostolic authorship, he believes that it and the Fourth Gospel may possibly be from the same hand. Above all, he breaks away from the reference to the contemporary situation. That these positions will be finally made good may well be doubted; but it is salutary to have the problems raised again by so competent a scholar. In French we have a recent commentary by Loisy. I have found myself in much fuller agreement with it than with any other of his commentaries.

I ought to mention in conclusion Field's *Notes on the Translation of the Old Testament* (a posthumous expansion of *Otium Norvicense*, Pars tertia). It contains a wealth of suggestion on philology and interpretation by a scholar whose erudition was of exceptional range.

I need hardly repeat that much precious exegetical material is to be found in the literature on the New Testament outside the commentaries; but this has been rigidly excluded in order to keep the articles within due limits.

A Plea for the Study of Theology.

By the Reverend S. P. T. Prideaux, D.D., Salisbury Theological College.

At the recent annual Conference of the Principals of Theological Colleges held at Cambridge, allusion was made to a still prevailing prejudice against Theology as a subject of educational value. It is felt that Theology is narrow and technical, possibly obscurantist, unable to provide either valuable knowledge or mental stimulus and exercise, and in particular that candidates for the Sacred Ministry are far better advised to study arts or history or one other of the regular subjects for their degree, as likely to obtain thereby both a better grounding in knowledge and a better discipline for their mental faculties.

Let it be admitted at the outset that there is justification for this attitude. In the past the teaching of Theology has been academic, unintelligent, and unrelated to the problems of everyday life. So much is evident to any student of Church history, and it is even within the recollection of many who are still living. But there is no reason why the teaching of Theology should be so mismanaged any more than that of any other subject, and as a matter of fact as a subject Theology covers far more ground, penetrates deeper, and is ultimately more practical in its bearings than any subject in the educational curriculum, so that this prejudice is like many others, mistaken and erroneous.

What are the subjects covered by the word Theology? They include the Bible, the history of the Christian Church and its beliefs (or doctrines), its practice (or ethics), and its worship. To these should be added the comparative study of other religions as providing the necessary background and contrast to that religion which is specially in view. It is a short list, but its implications and requisites are indeed many.

Consider first the range which is covered by the word 'Bible.' The study of the Bible involves much that is required of the student of classical literature. It requires the knowledge of at least two languages, Hebrew and Greek, and to these Latin is a desirable if not a necessary addition (Latin is certainly required later, and one or more modern languages are of great assistance, not to say indispensable). The study of these languages carries with it grammar and some philology, and the mental gymnastic and the acquisition of exactness and accuracy incidental thereto. (Accuracy and clearness of thought will be demanded later on by the need of distinguishing between *homoousion* and *homoiousion*, of apprehending the purport and intention of 'transubstantiation,' of realizing the essential difference between Christianity and other religions, and so forth.) Having mastered the languages of the Bible, the student proceeds to its contents, and the subject-matter of Holy Scripture alone is a university curriculum in itself. It begins with a theory of the origin of the universe and of men; and it proceeds to an account of the development of the human race and of a particular people, which it traces for at least two thousand years, and through many stages and vicissitudes. That the Old Testament presents a philosophy of history

rather than a narrative adds to its educational value. But this story can only be apprehended against its world background, and this requires the study of several successive ancient civilizations, Babylon, Egypt, Assyria, again Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome. (Does any 'School of History' cover so much ground?) With the New Testament and afterwards another two thousand years are added, which include the story of the European peoples, their growth from barbarism to civilization, the growth of nations and Empires, the decline and revival of learning, the birth of national self-consciousness, self-determination and expansion, and the impact of European civilization upon the child-races. All these are the background and environment of the study of the Christian religion, the two being inextricably mingled and each inexplicable without the other.

It is evident that geographical study, if not deep or scientific, at least extends to the whole known world and is therefore comprehensive; and some knowledge of archæological method and discovery is picked up at a good many stages. Pictorial art, architecture, and literature all come under some consideration.

The study of the Hebrew people raises many ethnological and anthropological problems, and their development is most interesting, from the early stage of a nomad Bedouin clan to a group of clans, then to a people, and finally to a nation. This is the process by which all nations more or less have been evolved, and when it is realized that the Jews, the subject of the study, have proved themselves to be a people who have survived over a greater number of years than any other known race, and under very widely varying conditions, and during that time have exercised a not at all inconsiderable part in human history, both in their actual influence on events and their contribution to the outlook of humanity, the value of such study should need no advertisement.

In particular there is a close parallel between the impact on the Hebrews, in the days of Solomon, of the culture of the Egyptians and Phœnicians, and the impact, to-day, of twentieth-century civilization on the peoples of Africa and the East. (Similarly, the position of Christianity to-day in India has several resemblances to its position in the Roman Empire in the first three centuries of our era, and the crowding of the mass movements into the Church reported in some areas is exactly analogous to the influx of barely converted heathen into the Church after Constantine and the later inclusion of the barbarian European peoples. The situation has its bearings on the problem in this country of the desirability of indiscriminate baptism.)

For the study of social problems the Old Testament is equally valuable. The Hebrews developed a strong ethical sense; and their early legislation, which began with Moses, prescribes the due and proper relation between man and man, master and servant, ruler and subject, and deals with the many problems incidental to the ownership of property, commerce, marriage, slavery, and so forth, which still demand attention. The passing from the nomad to the agricultural stage, and then to that of settled city life, is all considered and treated, and the weaknesses and temptations and dangers of an elaborate culture were constantly before the eyes of their teachers, the prophets. The philanthropic ideal, consideration for the poor and the weak, the outcast and distressed, appears early; it receives much development in post-exilic times and is an honoured predecessor to the Christian philanthropy which has governed and still inspires much modern social legislation. Social study is brought before the student continually, with the needs of the Early Church, the attempted (and soon renounced) communism of the Jerusalem Church, the social activities of bishops, monasteries, and nunneries (if the abolition of the latter in England were not the most potent origin of the Poor Law it was a contributary cause), and the Anabaptist risings on the Continent.

Political problems are constantly presenting themselves. From the Book of Judges downwards the methods and ideals of national life and policy and relations with other Powers are never absent from the story. The great prophets from the eighth century B.C. play the part which to-day is played by cabinet ministers, members of Parliament, and the writers of leading articles in the daily newspapers and the monthly reviews. Their problems have very much in common, and the intelligent student of one inevitably transfers his thoughts to the other and compares them. Later, problems of the relation of religious bodies to the civil power, *i.e.* of Church and State, are seldom absent, and there is no situation, from those described in the Acts of the Apostles, all through the ages as far as the Reformation and onwards, from which a useful parallel and valuable lesson or principle cannot be drawn.

One perennial religious problem in particular was realized and faced by the prophets, and their treatment of it is of permanent value. Every missionary Church has to wean its converts from

religious beliefs and practices which are on a low level of thought and degrading in influence; a materialistic, external, and often sensual cultus has to be replaced by a spiritual religion. That was the situation in the days of the Hebrew monarchy; it was repeated after Constantine and after the so-called 'conversion' of Europe; it is occupying the close attention of the Church to-day in the mission field. But it is a situation which never leaves us; in this country to-day there are very many people whose religious mentality has hardly progressed beyond that of the Hebrews in the days of the Judges. Once more the practical nature and up-to-dateness of the study of Theology is evident.

If it be true that 'the proper study of mankind is man,' then no better subject can be found for it than Theology. For Theology is fundamentally the most human of subjects, dealing with the human personality in all its phases, developments, and relations. Recollect the various types of individuals, their experiences, efforts, and achievements: Jacob, the man of low and mean cunning but yet with the power of spiritual development, who triumphs over his lower self; Esau, the 'hail fellow well met,' careless and impulsive, the slave to his appetites, and quite unable to rise to spiritual things; Moses, the ardent social reformer and national deliverer; David, the national hero, the Henry v. or Henry VIII. of his people, generous, passionate, popular, the successful soldier, falling into gross sin yet repentant—the whirligig of time bringing in its revenges in his old age; Solomon, the young man of high ideals and good intentions spoiled by luxury and wealth and self-indulgence; Jeremiah, the sensitive, the unwilling prophet yet unable to hold his peace, suffering greatly for conscience' sake (he is comparable to the genuine 'conchy' of 1914–18); Ezekiel, the man with the temper and outlook of both prophet and priest, able in national disaster to hold together two often inharmonious groups of people and to lay wise and sure foundations for 'reconstruction' after the Exile; Nehemiah, the devout layman, realizing his people's need, surrendering his prospects, facing great risks and greater difficulties, with a genius for handling men and winning their loyalty by his personal example, self-sacrifice, and unaffected piety; Judas Maccabæus, the Garibaldi of his generation. There are the Twelve Apostles, every one different, a most representative team to preach the good news to needful man: Peter, used to hard work and simple living, impulsive, 'rocky' yet capable of becoming a 'rock'; John, the visionary and mystic, whose fiery nature can be sublimated into the steady fire of adoring love; Philip the Greek; Judas the business man; Simon the Zealot (*i.e.* Sinn Feiner or Bolshevist); Thomas the sceptical. There is Paul the young Varsity man, of good birth and position, well educated, with a passion for reality, excitable with a tendency to be neurotic, unsatisfied by traditional religion and winning his way violently through reaction after reaction into the Kingdom, and then pouring out his all in one continuous sacrifice to his beloved Master, racing from place to place in his mission to the Gentile peoples. (Some of our missionary leaders to-day are paralleled in him.) Later we have Arius, the 'plain man' of limited vision and ruled by his logic; Pelagius, the characteristic Briton, confident in his self-dependence, the exemplar in his way of Kipling's 'If'; Augustine, the uninspired and sensual 'hack' teacher, the penitent saint and theologian of the highest order; Aquinas, Luther, Erasmus, Wolsey, More, George Herbert, William Law, Butler, Hoadly, Wesley, Shaftesbury, and a hundred others.

The study of Christian doctrine necessitates a preliminary study of human thought or philosophy, and of the efforts of man to attain to the apprehension of reality and the perception of truth. Theism, the Incarnation, the Sacraments, all raise problems of metaphysics, and of the relation between the historic and the timeless, the material and the spiritual. The heresies are by no means dead or to be buried and forgotten; they represent various ways in which the human mind works and approaches certain phenomena of experience, and they are liable to perpetual reappearance; whence the value of the knowledge of how the Church has dealt with them. Some psychology is as inevitable—not necessarily academic psychology or always expressed in the latest scientific jargon; but at all events a working knowledge of the human mind and will and emotions, for which the literature and language of devotion and liturgical forms will provide some of the subject-matter.

On a broad view the student learns much of the human process and experience, the human temperament and its variations and reactions. He notes the ebb and flow, the rise and fall, of the impulse towards an ideal; the ever-present tendency to relapse, the ease of degradation, the permanence of superstition, the value and the danger of religious institutions (he will find eighth-century B.C. Hebrew Priests in the Mediæval Church, Sadducees in the Close at 'Barchester,' Pharisees in Islam and in the Church), and because he studies humanity in its most vital and deepest experi-

ences and in the exercise of its spiritual faculties as well as in its physical, social, political, and mental, his study is the most comprehensive and the farthest reaching. He learns to take broad and long views ; to distinguish between the general and the particular, the essential and the non-essential ; to be impartial in his judgments. He is also in close touch with life. He studies the vital problems of the past—individual, social, political, ecclesiastical, intellectual, spiritual, religious. For the discharge of citizenship, for the administration of the Church, for teaching, for handling situations, and for dealing with individuals, the study of Theology provides the necessary equipment. And because its aim is the helping of man to become and to remain his best self and to deliver him from evil, because it looks to man's final end, it is ultimately the most practical and effective of all studies. The Queen of Sciences has not yet surrendered her throne.

Literature.

SIXTEENTH CENTURY PURITANISM.

This new book of the Rev. A. F. Scott Pearson, D.Th., D.Litt., F.R.Hist.S., *Church and State : Political Aspects of Sixteenth Century Puritanism* (Cambridge University Press ; 7s. 6d. net), adds to the praise which he had already won by his former monumental work on 'Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 1535–1603.' In that volume he not only lifted Elizabethan Puritanism out of obscurity, but he did what was more difficult, he cleared it from obloquy due in no small measure to prejudice ; setting it in the place of honour and respect which was its historic due.

Here in this excellent work, which it would be difficult to overpraise both for the patience of its research and for the historical purity of its statements, he pursues the same theme, showing by ample documentary proof what Cartwright's presbyterian polity was—as it affected the State—on what principles it was based and by what arguments defended. Dr. Pearson deals with these views under the rubrics of (1) the two-kingdom theory—so well known to every Scotsman from the historic saying of Andrew Melville to James I. about 'two kings and two kingdoms in this realm' ; (2) sovereignty, which raises the vital question of Christ and Cæsar ; (3) obedience, etc.,—all aspects of the one theme, the relation between Church and State, politics and religion.

It is a problem of living interest, and to read carefully the present volume is a valuable orientation for the understanding not only of an interesting historical period, but of the problem as it is actually facing Presbyterianism to-day. Cartwright mediated between the sycophantic Erastianism of Whitgift and the individualistic licence of Anabaptism, advocating an ordered Church system at once popularly representative and spiritually authoritative—distinguishing the spiritual realm from the political—with graded organs of rule and expression—in short, a constituted Presbyterianism. This he thought he found in Scripture and in the best classic models of antiquity. The autocracy of Elizabeth was not absolutely necessary for the *bene esse* of the Church.

How Cartwright's views were related to those of the continental reformers, and how they may have influenced Melville and others in Scotland—all that is carefully considered, and there is an interesting discussion on the influence of Aristotle's Politics on Puritanism which at any rate shows that there was from the beginning in Puritanism a rich strain of Humanism mingled with the main stream of Scriptural theologizing and earnest piety.

Dr. Pearson is not an apologist here for Cartwright, but no one can read this book without being convinced that Presbyterianism is both on Scriptural and rational grounds a great ideal, and that without something like it in spirit and form the vexed problem of Church and State cannot be solved.

Be that as it may, this notable book gives its author a distinguished place in the front rank of competent historians.

PROFESSOR McFADYEN ON THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Encouraged (we fancy) by the popularity of a former book—'The Use of the Old Testament'—Professor J. E. McFadyen, D.D., has added to it a pendant or supplement in *Old Testament Scenes and Characters* (James Clarke ; 6s. net). He cannot

write too many books of this kind for his readers. The easy style, the obvious mastery of his subject, the combination of religious insight and scientific accuracy, make this new book, as it made the other, both delightful and profitable to read.

In the present book we have a selection of historical narratives which were omitted in 'The Use of the Old Testament,' and, in addition, passages in the Prophets and the Psalms as specimens of good exposition and teaching. The information given as a basis of understanding is sufficient in every case, and every section closes with a definite indication of the permanent meaning and message of the passage expounded. Both teachers and preachers will find these chapters helpful in a high degree. The modern point of view is assumed throughout, but it is never obtruded. And we can imagine both fundamentalist and modernist using this book with equal facility and equal reward.

One thing we are specially grateful for, Dr. McFadyen realizes that teaching the Bible is not merely teaching its geography and history. The essence of religious teaching is to bring out the eternal truth in the Word of God. This he points out in a preliminary essay on the task of the teacher. And he confirms it by his own example throughout the book. Professor McFadyen is a skilled and scientific scholar, and no one is doing more to make the Old Testament a living book to the ordinary educated mind.

A DOCTRINE OF MAN.

Professor J. F. Bethune-Baker, D.D., F.B.A., has collected nine of his lectures and has published them under the title *The Way of Modernism, and Other Essays* (Cambridge University Press; 6s. net), 'in the hope that, read together, they may be found to offer a way of approach for our own generation to that synthesis of old ideas and new knowledge which has been the aim of "modernism" in all ages.' Some of the lectures have already been published in 'The Modern Churchman.' They deal with 'The Way of Modernism,' 'The Use of Holy Scripture To-day,' 'Evolution and Christian Theology,' 'Evolution and Incarnation,' 'Jesus as Human and Divine,' 'The Christian Doctrine of Man,' 'Our Traditional Formularies.' Very much that is stimulating will be found in these essays. When we turn to the 'Christian Doctrine of Man,' for example, we find that it is a plea that a doctrine of Man should be stated consistent with the conviction that the truth about Man is disclosed in Jesus Christ no less than the truth about God. Only so will we have 'a "Christian" doctrine of Man, by which Man to-day may be "saved."'

'For all that we know to-day of the constitution of the universe, of the whole realm of Nature, of the processes that have been and are in operation, of all the history of the world and Man, obliges us either to leave God out of account, or else to see Him in the whole evolutionary process, with Man as fellow-worker with Him and the higher stages of the process, which begin with man's appearance on the scene, as much dependent on Man as on God. "We are God's fellow-workers"—we are partners with Him in the whole business of life, in the whole process of the world.

'Some years ago we were urged to give up our phrase, "Incarnation" as a pagan conception. But that is not our way. Phrases, ideograms, are not like wine-skins. More and more with growing knowledge we fill our Christian ideograms with new content and they bear the pressure, and again and again we find that an old "formula" has a far wider application and a deeper verification than those who used it in the past could know. We talk less glibly of "dead" matter than our fathers did. And more and more I am sure it will be found that "Incarnation" is the term that best expresses for us the truth about the world and Man. It is all Incarnation: a process, from the beginning, if beginning there was, to the end, if end there be.

'My appeal to you is this. In the past the Church has limited its doctrine of Incarnation to its interpretation of one historical experience, an experience which marked the culmination of one stage in the evolution of Man and the beginning of a new era. For Jesus was the Supreme Idealist, and wherever His Spirit has had free course it has been impossible for any one to think of God or of Man or of human society as men thought before. The Church has been the guardian of a great Revelation, but it has used it almost exclusively for its doctrine of God. Yet the one certain fact is that Jesus was a man, and of course the doctrine of the Church has preserved this fact. But it has never yet used it in its doctrine of Man. It has isolated "the man Jesus" from His place in the historic evolutionary process. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." Oh, there is evidence enough of other interpretations before we entered the prison-house of Latinized and world-denying Christianity.

'It is irrational to-day to use your Incarnation only for your doctrine of God, and not for your

doctrine of Man. The God-Man is a revelation of Everyman as well as of God, and your doctrine of Everyman must be derived from what He was.'

THE QUEST OF RELIGION.

The Rev. Canon C. E. Raven, D.D., in *The Quest of Religion* (S.C.M.; 4s. net), disarms criticism by his modest opinion of the worth of his own book. He calls it a 'poor thing' and 'scrappy,' but the reader will thank him for the pleasure and the profit of reading a book written in such a fine catholic and eirenic spirit and of such obvious merit.

Starting from the basic religious element in our nature—call it the sense of the numinous or by any other name—he describes its forms of expression, and subjects these forms—and they are often grotesque enough—to rational tests that determine their validity. He then finds these valid tests satisfactorily met and fully satisfied in the revelation and redemption of Jesus Christ. It is a fine piece of real apologetic traversing the realm of Christian experience and doctrine, and there is an ease and glow about the treatment that cheer the heart of the Christian reader and that are bound, we fancy, to exert a healthy contagious influence even on the indifferent and the doubting. The appended note on Science and Religion contains a weighty criticism of Behaviourism as a theory of the human spirit. In so small a book one ought not to expect a deep handling of the great topics of theology, but perhaps for that very reason the book may find a welcome in many quarters where a more pretentious volume could not enter; but on reading it we wonder if a treatment of the Atonement more cognizant of the New Testament experience could not be given by the writer.

In one place only did we feel anything like a discord—where the writer quotes two lines of a hymn:

> And Jesus raised His languid eye
> And met His Father's anger.

With his criticism of that we heartily agree, but is it right to call it 'typical of much of Protestant theology'? For our own part we have come across the notion more frequently in Catholic art and Catholic sermons than in Protestantism. It were better to criticise it without labelling it on quarters where surely it would be repudiated. It is impossible to read this small book without being refreshed in mind and cheered in spirit—and we can cordially recommend it to all who desire a treatment of Christian truth from the wide outlook of religious experience in general and Christian comprehensiveness in particular.

LIGHT FROM THE ANCIENT EAST.

The new and revised edition of Professor Adolf Deissmann's 'Paul' has been followed by a new and revised edition of his *Light from the Ancient East* (Hodder & Stoughton; 42s. net). Though Dr. Deissmann's translator, Mr. Lionel R. M. Strachan, M.A., was unable to undertake the new edition of 'Paul,' he has been able to find time for the adaptation of his former translation of *Licht vom Osten* (first published in 1908) in conformity with the edition of 1923, on which the present volume is based. In the German edition of 1923 there are very considerable alterations of the old matter, and large additions of new matter; in particular the number of facsimiles of ancient texts is greatly increased. (There are 83 illustrations in the German edition of 1923, and 85 in the present translation.)

Perhaps it may be well to indicate, for the sake of those who are unacquainted with this important book, what Dr. Deissmann seeks to accomplish through its pages. It is to fill in some gaps in the historical background of primitive Christianity and, incidentally, to counteract extreme views concerning the value of the literary memorials of the Imperial period. There are some who think that a study of the literary memorials alone should enable us to restore the historical background of primitive Christianity; but Dr. Deissmann reminds us that in the literary memorials the lower classes (among whom Christianity first spread) are seldom allowed to speak, and he insists upon the indirect value of the non-literary texts (as these are found in inscriptions on stone, metal, etc., in texts on papyrus and parchment, and in texts on ostraca or potsherds) as throwing light upon the language, literature, and religion of the New Testament. He is chiefly concerned with non-Christian texts in Greek and Latin.

One hardly knows which to admire most, the massiveness of Dr. Deissmann's learning, or the grace and vividness of his style. He recaptures for us from the Egyptian rubbish-heaps much of the history of the Hellenized and Romanized world in which Christianity gained its early triumphs, and impresses us with the importance and great potentialities of the work which is being so eagerly pursued in our day among the papyri and the ostraca, both Græco-Roman and Semitic. It is in this last reference that he says, and we are inclined to agree with him, 'What would we give

if we could recover but one papyrus book with a few leaves containing genuine Aramaic sayings of Jesus! For those few leaves we would, I think, part smilingly with the theological output of a whole century.'

JESUS AS I SEE HIM.

Jesus as I see Him, by Johannes Müller, translated by Hilda Bell (Bagster & Sons; 3s. 6d. net), is another interpretation of Jesus, despite the author's disclaimer. It could not help being an interpretation, and we welcome it just because it is Jesus from another angle. The book is a most interesting one, and will be read with gratitude and profit, even by those who (like ourselves) cannot go all the way with the author. The main burden of this 'vision' of Christ is that in Jesus the Divine life was so rich and full and spontaneous that it accounts for everything. Spontaneous especially, for this is what the writer over and over stresses. And it is here we find ourselves unable to see as he does. 'His spiritual life was not a sequence of perception, formation of opinion, the will to do, the deed, the life; but through very experience of the life of God he received and conceived so strongly and clearly that the truth was born of itself, and God's will fulfilled at the instant. . . . It was not a conscious movement of the will, but an inward urge to which he responded with all his heart and soul. . . . He simply expressed what was given him at the moment. . . . He set himself no ideal of his life's task, did not ponder his duty, make resolutions, or aim at a definite goal . . . did nothing of himself, was influenced by nothing, not even by his own thoughts.' All this is so emphasized as to give the impression that Jesus had no hand in His own experience, and that He neither thought of His life's problem nor explained what He had found. His life and achievement were reception only and always. This is Jesus as the distinguished writer sees Him, and if it seems to us not in accord with the facts of the Gospels, we can see the truth in it and the grandeur of that truth of the fulness of Divine life in Jesus. Jesus is inexhaustible, and every new 'vision' of Him gives us something. The something in this case is of real worth, and we gratefully receive it.

NOTES ON ST. LUKE AND THE ACTS.

Notes on St. Luke and the Acts (Oxford University Press; 3s. net), by Mr. Alexander Pallis, concludes the series of suggestions which the author has contributed towards the elucidation of the canonical historical books of the New Testament. Those who are acquainted with the author's previous contributions will expect to find here new and interesting interpretations of the traditional text and plausible emendations of it in corrupt or difficult places, nor will they be disappointed. In his interpretations and emendations the author shows himself to be well versed in both classical and modern Greek; indeed, he brings to his studies in the New Testament an unusual linguistic equipment. We commend his learned and scholarly notes to the attention of students of the New Testament text, who will find in them much that is helpful and suggestive.

To take a single instance at random. In Luke 4^{36} we read, τίς ὁ λόγος οὗτος ὅτι κ.τ.λ. The rendering in A.V. is 'What a word is this!'; in R.V., 'What is this word?'; in a well-known modern version, 'What does this mean?' But Mr. Pallis adduces evidence to show that these versions are wide of the mark. The combination of ὁ λόγος οὗτος is still alive, he tells us, in modern Greek in the form of τοῦ λόγου του as a respectful expression, which avoids αὐτὸς as too crude and corresponds to *his honour* in English; so that the correct rendering is simply, 'Who is this that,' etc. It is pointed out that Luke 7^{49} provides an almost exact parallel and supports the interpretation here advocated.

FREEDOM OF THE WILL.

The aim of Professor Herbert Wildon Carr, D.Litt., LL.D., in his book, *The Unique Status of Man* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net), is to vindicate human freedom particularly against the scientific materialism which would make man simply a necessitated factor in a rigid mechanistic system. The 'unique status of man' is that he is a being set free by evolution and entrusted with freedom—which he may abuse—his fate and future being thus placed in his own hand (p. 211). Professor Carr attempts to turn the tables on mechanistic determinism by showing that on the modern views of physics and the principles of relativity spontaneity is the characteristic of all life, and self-determining spontaneity the unique characteristic of man. He thus gives the primacy to freedom—necessity being its orderly way of managing reality. The conclusion is excellent and, we hope, true, but it is doubtful if the reasoning leading up to it will command general acceptance or approve itself as always relevant.

Lord Macaulay somewhere tells of a judge who was going out to India and to whom a friend gave this advice: 'Give your decisions firmly, but don't give elaborate reasons for them. Your decisions will be accepted, your reasoning rejected.' Unfortunately metaphysicians cannot dispense with reasoning, although one of the greatest of them (Bradley) said that metaphysics was finding bad reasons for what we already believe upon instinct. The most interesting parts of this volume in our opinion are the historical, especially where the writer deals with philosophical matters. Excellent and interesting reviews of Spinoza, Leibniz, Newton, Voltaire, Rousseau, Comte, Mill, and Spencer are given which are a contrast in lucidity to the somewhat laboured chapters on modern physics and relativity. We have a suspicion that the writer is less at home in the theological and ethical portions of his subject. Paul and Pascal would have a word to say about the sublimating philosophical process to which their views are here subjected. What Luther called 'the freedom of a Christian man' is a more serious and vital problem and moves in a higher realm than the bare spontaneity or natural capacity for freedom which is mainly dealt with here. Still, it is good news to those who may be in the thraldom of a rigid mechanistic view of life to be told on weighty scientific grounds that science, instead of closing men in a prison of rigid necessity, opens the door into a realm of freedom; and that is what the writer endeavours to do and accomplishes with no little success.

THE SITE OF HAZOR.

Hitherto most scholars have placed the ancient town of Hazor, famous in Egyptian and Israelite records, at *el-Hurebeh*, about five miles due west of the northern part of Lake Huleh, and about three miles south-west of Kadesh. The name seems to survive there in *Merdj-Hadhireh*, which is applied to the region round about. It would be equally possible also to place it at other spots in this region or farther south. But Dr. J. Garstang, writing on 'The Site of Hazor' in the *Annals of Archæology and Anthropology* (vol. xiv. Nos. 1 and 2), gives reasons for identifying it with the great camp-enclosure (1000 m. by 400 m.) at *el-Kedah*, on the north side of the *Wady el-Wakkas*, four miles south-west-west of the southern extremity of the lake. This enclosure, which does not seem to have been occupied for over a thousand years, is comparable in area and character with the great camp at *Misrifeh*, north-east of Homs in Central Syria, lately excavated by Lieut. du Mesnil du Buisson (*Syria*, vii. 4, viii. 1), though the latter only goes back to the Middle Bronze Age and is believed by Dr. Albright and others to be of Hyksos origin. It is probable that Dr. Garstang is right in his view. No excavation has yet been possible, but the enclosure, which forms an isolated platform surrounded by huge ramparts some forty metres high, and is situated at the juncture of important roads from east, south, and west, gives unmistakable and abundant traces of the Early Bronze Age, as well as of later times, and seems to satisfy several of the conditions better than the old location does. It corresponds exactly with the derivation of the word חצר (' to enclose,' like a cattle-yard or camp); it agrees with the *Maher's* account in the Papyrus Anastasi I., according to which the town was associated with a river; it certainly suits better the Hazor of 1 Mac 11[67] and Jos. *Antiq.* XIII. v. 7; and it is on the main road from Egypt to Damascus, as well as on the main road from the south to Sidon, with which latter place both the Tel el-Amarna Letters and the Biblical narrative associate it. Some of Dr. Garstang's reasons, however, are probably incorrect, although these do not affect his argument. It is doubtful, for instance, whether Jabin, king of Hazor, had any connexion with Sisera, whose central camp lay at Harosheth (*el-Hârithiyeh*), about fifty miles away. The former belongs probably to quite a different tradition—the one recording Joshua's victory over the northern confederation of Canaanite kings (Jos 11[1-9]) near the waters of Merom—and this has been interwoven with the Sisera narrative. It is even more doubtful whether Dr. Garstang is correct in placing Dor at *Tell Abu Shusheh*, between Jokneam and Megiddo, for, according to Solomon's administrative system, Dor ('Nâfat' Dor) and Esdraelon were separate districts, and Dr. Garstang's location (which is also that of Pythian-Adams) would place the former within the heart of the latter, and cannot therefore be correct. The term 'Nâfat' is generally understood as 'height,' but the meaning intended is probably 'coast region' (ἡ παραλία, as Symmachus renders the term), from the idea 'cliff,' 'precipice,' and hence Dor must be located at *Tanturah*, on the coast, nine Roman miles north of Cæsarea. Even though these and other changes be made, however, in Dr. Garstang's argument, the dominant strategic situation of *el-Kedah* remains, and accords perfectly with all the known indications as to the site of Hazor. It seems a pity that such an important enclosure should remain unexcavated.

A book of considerable interest has been compiled dealing with the story of Richard Baxter's married life: *Richard Baxter and Margaret Charlton:* A Puritan Love-story, being the Breviate of the Life of Margaret Baxter, 1681, with Introductory Essay, Notes and Appendices by the Rev. John T. Wilkinson, M.A., B.D. (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). In the long introductory essay the author gives a full account of the history of the 'Breviate,' and of the relations of Baxter with the aristocratic young friend who was to become his wife. She seems to have been a woman of extraordinary parts, 'one in a thousand,' and the story of the relations of the stern Puritan with her and of their happy married life is one of the romances of biography. The 'Breviate' is Baxter's own account of his wife's life and character. Love affairs were very different in these serious days! There are photographs here of the lady herself, of her mother, of Baxter, of Apley Castle, the bride's home, and of much else. Altogether, this is a sound piece of historical work on which we congratulate the author, and for which we are grateful.

Suttee, by Mr. Edward Thompson (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), is 'a historical and philosophical enquiry into the Hindu rite of widow burning.' It claims to be the first monograph on the subject in any language. The author has done his work with great care and thoroughness, writing out of a full knowledge of the history and religious thought of India and with a deep love for the country and its peoples. No one who reads the record will disagree with his verdict that 'the discipline that made suttee possible was a discipline of slaves; and the civilization that hounded widows, in the first moment of grief or surprise, into a declaration that they would die, and then forbade their withdrawal, was a barbarous one.' It may be thought that as the rite of suttee is now illegal no practical purpose is served by further discussion, but Mr. Thompson writes with an eye upon present-day educated Hindu opinion which still glorifies the spirit of suttee. He believes 'the time is come for a much more radical sifting of Hindu tradition by Indians themselves. . . . The criticism that matters is their own; and on this question, of woman's position in society and her duties towards man, that criticism has not been searching or brave enough. . . . The nonsense about the wonderful purity and spirituality of the Hindu marriage ideal cannot survive examination; still less can the sex-obsession and the social system which, in making one sex the unpitied servant of the other, drains and destroys both.' It may be noted that the author for convenience uses the anglicized spelling *suttee* for the rite of widow burning, and, in accordance with Hindu usage, reserves the form *sati* (faithful) for the victim who is sacrificed.

Christianity and Nature, by the Rev. John T. Bird, C.M.G., M.A., F.S.A.S. (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net), is a somewhat slight treatment of a great subject. In Part I. the writer briefly expounds 'the idea that a spiritual affinity exists between the human mind and the external world, while the belief is expressed that such an affinity is to be found at its highest in the personality of Christ—the Eternal Word, creative and immanent—and manifests itself in His parabolic teaching.' Part II. consists of a catena of 'spiritual analogies from nature, astronomy and general physics.' These analogies are on the whole somewhat too obvious to be impressive, and perhaps the most valuable element in the book is the abundance of quotations which are cited in support of them.

Under the title *Four Ancient Manuscripts in the Bible House Library* (British and Foreign Bible Society; 1s.), the Rev. R. Kilgour, D.D., the capable and energetic Editorial Superintendent and Librarian of the British and Foreign Bible Society, describes certain specimens of Scripture manuscripts which are among his treasures at the Bible House. By far the most precious possession of the Library is Papyrus Q, for which the claim is made that it is not only the earliest Coptic manuscript of the Fourth Gospel, but also one of the oldest manuscripts—Sir Herbert Thompson assigns it to the third quarter of the fourth century—containing anything approaching a complete Gospel in any tongue. We cannot but be infected by Dr. Kilgour's enthusiasm for Papyrus Q, to which half of his booklet is devoted, and he also succeeds in enlisting our interest in Codex Zacynthius (Codex Ξ), a Greek palimpsest containing a large part of the Third Gospel, and in the two other manuscripts on which he informs us, namely, B.H. Syr. 1, a copy of the New Testament in Syriac (*c.* A.D. 1000), and B.H. Syr. 2, another copy of the Peshiṭta version of the New Testament (*c.* A.D. 1216).

Dr. Kilgour's enthusiasm for Papyrus Q is the enthusiasm not so much of the scholar as of the missionary. He explains that it was a Gospel for common peasants in their own vulgar tongue, being written in the Coptic vernacular (Sahidic and Sub-Achmimic), and that in its hoary antiquity it can proudly claim to be the forerunner of the

seventeen thousand volumes around it in the Bible House Library (containing some portion of the Bible in over eight hundred and fifty different languages), 'a prophecy and herald of what the Bible Society stands for—the Gospel for every man in the language in which he was born.' We understand that four-fifths of the human race may now hear the gospel in their own tongue, thanks largely to the Bible Society.

It should be noted that *A Manual of Christian Beliefs*, by Professor Edwin Lewis, is now published in this country by Messrs. T. & T. Clark (5s. net).

It is a pity when the title of a book gives no idea of its contents, especially when the book is on a vital subject by a vital writer. This is our only serious criticism of *A Mind for the Kingdom*, by Miss Hilda Tyacke Jacka (Edinburgh House Press; 1s. 6d. net). Now what do *you* think this book will be about? Take some guesses, and then read the sub-title, 'A Study in the Principles and Practice of Adult Missionary Education.' Did you hit it? Apart, however, from the title, the book itself is an admirable plea for (1) a wider and deeper view of education or rather of Christian education, which 'is not a special education, but the most general education imaginable; it is a whole view of the world in the light of a belief in God, an equipment in vision and knowledge for the true service of God and of man for His sake,' and (2) for a Christian philosophy of the universe which will comprehend the forces at present working in the world. This involves knowledge of other races, their faiths and ideals, as well as of our own inheritance. And Miss Jacka proceeds to lay down the lines on which such study is to be pursued. In addition to much guidance of a general kind, there are special hints on the value of group work, on the use of books, on the function of a leader, and even on the preparation of addresses. Christian education is missionary education, and there is a broad and statesmanlike vision in these chapters as well as a practical grasp of detailed study which will make the book of value to all who plan and direct adult education in our country.

The difficulty of interpreting aright the teaching of Jesus on non-resistance must always present itself to a reader of the Gospels. We have had many attempts to reconcile the words in the Sermon on the Mount with practical living, and once again Mr. Francis Horner essays the task in *Did Jesus Speak Absurdly?* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net). The book is in the form of letters to a friend who roundly declared the counsel of Jesus to be one of perfection and quite impracticable for ordinary life. This easy and human way of debate makes the book very readable. And we are allowed to see the objector gradually reduced to a better mind, and finally (as it would appear) convinced of his error. But will the reader be convinced? That is somewhat doubtful. The solution proposed, so far as we follow it, was that Jesus spoke the words, not to the world or to men generally. For them they would be impossible. But to *disciples*. For them His words are final, and for them possible. This does not seem to be quite an adequate vindication. The question remains, are they really practicable even for disciples? The parts of the book which show that all great causes demand great sacrifices are really persuasive. But we are left at the end not very clear in our minds that the difficulty has been met. All the same, the book is worth reading and will leave with the candid reader an impression that something has been done towards a solution.

The Redemption of Human Life, by Mr. G. B. Robson (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net), is a powerful plea for the application of the spirit of Jesus to all the social relations and problems of human life. It is all the more effective because it is written with restraint and keeps in close touch with history and experience. The writer does not abandon himself to truculent and sweeping criticisms, nor does he offer hastily conceived panaceas, but he patiently unfolds the spirit and attitude of Jesus and suggests ways in which it may be brought to bear on human relations so as to promote brotherhood among men. It is pre-eminently an interesting book, and this is due largely to the use of illustrative examples which bear the mark of being authentic transcripts of real life.

Dr. J. H. Ritson, the Secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, has had the happy inspiration of publishing a volume of sermons which he has preached on various occasions in aid of the work of the Society. The title is *The Bible among Men* (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). Few volumes of sermons can be so bright and pictorial as this one, for it leads us from land to land and sets before us a panorama of places and peoples. The general reader will gain from it a more adequate idea of the magnitude and variety of the Bible Society's work, and the preacher will find it a storehouse of suggestions for missionary sermons.

A third edition of *Catholic Faith in the Holy Eucharist*, edited by the Rev. C. Lattey, S.J. (Heffer ; 6s. net), has appeared. To this edition two further appendices have been added. The first is a description of the Slavo-Byzantine Liturgy, by Count Bennigsen, and the other contains a bibliographical note supplied by Père de la Taille, giving a list of his further publications upon the subject of his paper.

In *The Altars of the Old Testament* (Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, Leipzig ; geh. M.5), which, though published in Germany, is written in English, Mr. Harold M. Wiener is, as in most of his discussions, at once informing and polemical—fortunately here less polemical than informing. He passes under review most of the references to altars in the Old Testament, and subjects the very important ones, for example, Ex 20^{24-26}, Dt 12, to an elaborate investigation, the issue of which is that 'neither legislation interferes with the customary local worship of the country Israelite in the form in which we found it to exist.' The critics, it seems, are wrong who interpret Dt 12 as forbidding all sacrifice at any place whatever except at the religious capital. 'The views which here enjoyed the greatest currency of recent years are entirely baseless.' Wiener's opponents will probably remain unconvinced and unperturbed, but they will be grateful for the evidence he has collected with regard to various types of altars, including altars of incense, and for the questions he has raised with regard to Ezekiel's attitude to the Day of Atonement.

Books on Bunyan continue to flow from the press. Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have added an excellent volume to their 'People's Library'—*John Bunyan*, by the Very Rev. W. H. Hutton, D.D. (2s. 6d. net). It is in two parts, Life and Literature, the second perhaps the more valuable. Dean Hutton writes with profound admiration of the spiritual genius of Bunyan, though there is manifest at times a certain air of detachment from Bunyan's view of the religious life. His criticism of Bunyan's writings is enriched by a wide knowledge of English literature and occasional touches of whimsical humour. He concludes his study with an interesting comparison of Bunyan with Wesley. 'Wesley cries aloud for mercy on the sins of others. Bunyan weeps tears of blood for his own. With all his astounding service to mankind, Wesley is always a conceited egoist ; but Bunyan is a frail man among human sinners. . . . So Bunyan could never have led a crusade or founded a new sect or organised a religious victory. Yet he understood men and women as Wesley never did ; and most of all children.'

A bibliography of immense value to all who take the study of the Old Testament seriously has been drawn up by Mr. John A. Maynard, Fellow of the Society of Oriental Research (Luzac ; 4s. 6d. net). Its title is *Seven Years of Old Testament Study*, and it covers the period from 1917 to 1924. It presents a list of one thousand seven hundred and forty-five titles of books and magazine articles, in English, French, German, Dutch, Italian, Spanish, and occasionally other languages, to which is frequently appended a list of the magazine articles containing criticisms to which those books or articles have been subjected. Nor are we put off with bare lists, valuable as these would be : the lists are followed by a page or two of very useful descriptive comment upon some, at least, of the books listed—comment which can be at times quite pungent, as when a book of Wiener's is referred to as 'an answer to Kuenen which lacks method but makes up for it, in the words of "Month," by a certain frank brutality.' The topics successively dealt with are General Introduction, including Translations, History of Israel, Modern Criticism, Methods of Criticism, Hebrew Poetry, etc. ; Grammar, including Comparative Philology, Monographs on special points ; The Pentateuch, Prophetical Books, Hagiographa, Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, and Hebrew Religion. The lists, which are conveniently arranged in the alphabetical order of the authors' names, are as nearly complete as any scheme so comprehensive can fairly be expected to be ; and a student working up a particular subject would find all the available relevant material to his hand at a moment's notice. We welcome this book as an indispensable adjunct of all serious Old Testament study.

An enormous amount of learning has been spent or misspent by Mr. George B. Michell, O.B.E., in endeavouring to prove the historical and chronological accuracy of the statements of the Bible. He has examined the chronology of Babylonia, Assyria, the Hittites, Elam, Persia, and Egypt, and also independently and without bias the chronology of the Bible ; and finds as the result that the former confirms the historical truth of the latter. In *The Historical Truth of the Bible*, Part I. (Marshall Brothers ; 7s. 6d. net), he presents in thirty-nine pages of parallel columns the results of his investiga-

tions in comparative chronology over the period from the creation of Adam to the death of Artaxerxes, and, though many of these dates are necessarily problematic, his tables have real value, enabling us to see at a glance what was happening in different countries at the same time.

But this type of book, though it is the fruit of wide study, makes no appeal to us, partly because we believe, with Coleridge, that the truth of the Bible 'finds' us, and that its religious truth would find us none the less, even though its chronology were demonstrably inaccurate; partly because such a discussion as this ignores the historical and literary criticism which has led scholars to their conclusions with regard, for example, to the relatively late date of Deuteronomy; and partly because the obvious animus against modern criticism stamps the writer as incompetent to do it justice—as when, for example, he speaks of 'the *clique* that has captured the seats of authority in Biblical exegesis in Great Britain and America,' or when he represents German criticism as trying to 'twist the Book of Deuteronomy into a production of the time of King Manasseh.' Even if we held it to be proved, as we are very far from doing, that the Flood began in 2522 B.C., that the Law was given on Sinai in June 1449 B.C., and that Moses died in March 1409 B.C., we should not think that the defence of Biblical truth or the cause of Biblical religion was furthered in the very least.

The Double Calls of God, by the Rev. E. J. Willis, B.D. (Marshall Brothers; 3s. 6d. net), is a devotional book of an earnest and improving type. Its view of Scripture is traditional, but readers who relish real piety and unction will find them in these chapters, along with abundance of devout interpretations applied to the spiritual life. The 'double calls' are those to Abraham, Jacob, Moses, and a number of other Scripture characters, to whom the Divine voice came repeated, as in 'Abraham, Abraham,' 'Martha, Martha,' and so with the rest. The discourses are well thought out, if the intellectual groundwork is often questionable, and many will find them full of real sustenance.

In his Presidential Address to the Society for Old Testament Study, Professor T. H. Robinson, D.D., discussed in an illuminating fashion *The Genius of Hebrew Grammar* (Milford; 1s. 6d.). Sporadic references not only to Semitic languages, such as Arabic, Assyrian, Phœnician, Syriac, and Modern Syriac, but to French, German, Italian, Welsh, Bengali, and Sanskrit show that he approaches his task with an unusually wide linguistic equipment. He rightly believes that grammar and syntax are an index to the soul of a people, and he uses the phenomena of Hebrew, for example, the construct and the use of the tenses, to illustrate the Hebrew outlook upon the world and upon history. The discussion, which is anything but dry, is still further enlivened by some extremely illuminating and suggestive metaphors, of which these are specimens. He compares the rush in the earlier part of a Hebrew word with the poise at the open pre-tone and the accent at the end, to the movement of wind-driven waves towards the shore—the moment of suspense as the water is caught by the shelving side, and then the crash and dash of the foaming water upon the shore. He compares the imperfect to a stream, and the perfect to a lake; or, again, the former to a cinema film, and the latter to the picture on a lantern slide. Against the prevalent view that the participle and the imperfect lend themselves to comparison in regard to their meaning and intention, Dr. Robinson thinks that the participle and the *perfect* may be more fittingly compared; while the imperfect describes process, the perfect denotes an event, and in the participle 'we stand in front of a picture.' All this and much else in the lecture is very helpful, and we agree with Dr. Robinson that 'no better instrument than the Hebrew mind could have been found for the supreme revelation of God.'

The Dean of Wells, Dr. J. Armitage Robinson, has published what he calls 'six plain sermons on the Holy Eucharist,' under the title *Giving and Receiving* (Murray; 2s. 6d. net). The distinguished name of the author, and his known ability, will cause his reflections to be read with respect. But we cannot honestly say we think the sermons contain any contribution to the subject or will give any assistance to inquiring minds. There is an almost painful desire to avoid going too far in either direction. And when the real difficulty emerges, and the real problem faces him, Dr. Robinson is constrained to say (in answer to the question, 'But in the interval, what of the elements?' the interval being between the celebration in Church and the carrying of the elements to the sick), 'Here, I am convinced, we must preserve a reverent silence.' The task of a spiritual guide in explaining what the real nature of the bread and wine is after consecration is a difficult one. Dr. Robinson rejects Transubstantiation, and also the idea that the bread and wine are 'mere signs or symbols.' They 'do not remain mere bread and

wine . . . as the Lord gives them to us they are raised to a higher power. . . . They are what they were, but they are more than they were before.' With the utmost desire to profit by Dr. Robinson's teaching we can only express utter bewilderment at words like these. He nowhere tells us what more the bread and wine become. The same confusion must assail any teacher who wishes to say that our Lord is not merely present in the *sacrament* to faith, but somehow or other in the elements themselves, but cannot say how. The two explanations, transubstantiation on the one hand, and the presence of Christ to the believer in the sacramental act on the other, are very clear and simple. Dr. Robinson finds a middle position, but cannot state it or elucidate it, and we can only feel that these sermons are for that reasons ingularly unenlightening. For the devout spirit in them we have nothing but appreciation.

In 'The Old Testament for Schools' Series the commentary on *The Book of Judges* has been placed in the competent hands of Principal A. R. Whitham, M.A. (Rivingtons; 2s. 6d.). Brief but useful prefatory chapters on the Value of Old Testament History, the Leading Ideas and Moral Difficulties, etc., of the Book, are followed by the commentary proper, which does not shirk difficulties, but deals with them helpfully (cf. note on ephod in 8^{27}). The attitude, while modern, might sometimes be a little more so; there might, for example, be a hint that the story of Gideon's fleece in 6^{36-40} is another and apparently inferior and mechanical version of the story of his call. But it is not easy to know just how much of the critical view of the Old Testament can be presented to, and assimilated by, the child—something will depend on his age; and the treatment of such problems in this volume is marked by a wise moderation. With its frequent test questions and its maps it can be cordially commended for the use of schools.

Bartoldi's huge statue of 'Liberty' at the entrance to the harbour of New York has the invitation inscribed on the pedestal, 'Send us your huddled masses yearning to be free.' It might have been worded in more polite language. But it matters little now. It is already out of date, and the legislation of the United States Congress imposing the most stringent limitation on immigrants has made the statue a ludicrous fraud. To get rid of our 'huddled masses' it is not enough to ask why not emigrate to the fertile lands awaiting cultivation in our far-spread Empire overseas. No doubt the clergy and ministers of all religious denominations are often asked for advice by people who would welcome the prospect of earning a living. In *Human Migration and the Future* (Seeley, Service; 12s. 6d. net), Professor J. W. Gregory, F.R.S., D.Sc., of Glasgow University, who has made a special study of the whole problem, deals with every aspect of it not only in Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, but in the United States, Brazil, and the Argentine. He writes with an intimate knowledge of the latest official reports and other recent literature published in this country and America, and his general conclusion is that there is still ample room in the temperate regions for emigrants from Europe. He has examined 'the general case against migration' and is of opinion that 'the effects of migration on both the countries whence the migrants come and whither they go are, under present conditions, highly beneficial, and that the evils attributed to it are exaggerated and overdrawn. Migration has been neither so futile for good, nor so productive of mischief, as its critics have maintained.' The United States and Canada nevertheless are more or less concerned about the large influx of so many foreign elements; whilst Australia is determined to avoid this danger.

A little volume of devotional meditation on our Lord's Passion is *A Place called Gethsemane*, by the Rev. A. C. Buchanan, B.D. (S.P.C.K.; 2s. 6d. net). The titles of the chapters will reveal the lines of the thought—'Steps to the Garden,' 'Symbolism of the Garden,' 'Shadows in the Garden,' 'Sacrifice in the Garden,' and so on. The spirit of the book is very fine. There is a good deal of imagination employed in the working out of the theme; and in an appendix there is detailed assistance for 'those who feel called to spend an hour sometimes with our Lord in Gethsemane.' This is not a book to criticise. We content ourselves with indicating its nature and contents.

The First Draft of St. Luke's Gospel (S.P.C.K.; 1s.) is a reprint from 'Theology.' The author is the Rev. Vincent Taylor, Ph.D., D.D., and the editor of 'Theology,' Dr. E. G. Selwyn, explains in a preface that there is here offered a provisional reconstruction of 'Proto-Luke,' a hypothetical document no doubt, but—as we must allow—one of the most interesting products of recent literary criticism of the Gospels.

When one considers the immense field now covered by archæologists one may be inclined to envy those who lived in the good old days when discovery was easier. To-day, in England at any

rate, it seems impossible to strike fresh ground. When, therefore, we take up such a volume as *Baptismal Fonts*, by Mr. E. Tyrrell-Green (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d.), it is without any expectation of finding much that is new, though the old may be presented in a new way. This volume belongs, we might say, to Charles Lamb's category of *biblia a-biblia*. It is really a catalogue, and certainly a very useful catalogue. Its title is descriptive: *Baptismal Fonts, Classified and Illustrated*. There are one or two introductory chapters explaining ancient baptismal practices, but the bulk of the one hundred and eighty pages is devoted to lists of styles in which an attempt has once again been made to reduce chaos to order. The system of classification is so far the most comprehensive we have seen.

A book for boys about prayer is a novelty. How many boys will appreciate it? Possibly far more than we imagine. Certainly it is a difficult book to write. It is easy to write for the 'pious' boy, and forget the other who is religious but not 'pi.' The writer of *The Quiet Adventure*, Mr. E. A. Willis, B.Sc., A.C.G.I. (S.C.M.; 2s. net), has generally steered clear of the shoals. It is perhaps difficult sometimes in reading to believe that there are many boys who are so earnest about religion that they will follow the writer. But the counsel, as well as the exposition, is generally healthy and practicable. And any boy who is thoughtful and sincere enough to wish help will not go unrewarded if he reads these pages.

We are beginning to have quite a number of books on the relation of psychology to religious training. This is inevitable, considering the place that psychology is now taking in education generally. And we cannot have too many such essays, if the writers know something about psychology and something about education, and something also about religion. The latest contribution is *Child Psychology and Religious Education*, by Miss Dorothy F. Wilson, B.Litt., who is assistant minister at Carr's Lane Church, Birmingham, and was until lately Young People's Secretary of the Presbyterian Church of England (S.C.M.; 4s. net, in paper covers 2s. 6d. net). Canon Streeter introduces the book. 'I first read this book not of choice, but of necessity. It was submitted as a thesis for a Research Degree and I was examiner; and I hate examining. To my surprise I found it extremely readable, as well as being . . . the best thing of its size that I had happened upon in this particular subject.' The teacher or parent who wishes some help in the conduct of his children's religious education will find in these pages much to think about. Miss Wilson brings, among other gifts, a great deal of common sense to her task, and both about education and about a child's religious development she has a great deal to say that will be useful both for guidance and warning. The teacher need not imagine that the author will do his work for him. But the general principles and the main facts and some of the inferences for religious training are all here. And no one will read the book without receiving both stimulus and light.

The Reformers and Holy Scripture (Thynne & Jarvis; 2s. 6d. net) is an historical investigation by the Rev. C. Sydney Carter, M.A., Litt.D., Principal of the Bible Churchmen's Missionary College. Dr. Carter's aim is to discover from contemporary and original sources the exact attitude towards the Bible which was taken by the great Reformation leaders, both Anglican and Continental, with the view of showing how far the varying modern schools of Christian thinkers and scholars have travelled since the days of the Reformation. He takes up in succession the subjects of the inspiration, the authority, and the interpretation of Holy Scripture, and under these rubrics arranges his material with scholarly care. Although Dr. Carter makes an historical investigation in the first instance, he does not fail to enforce his opinion that because of the Reformers' appeal to the Scriptures as fully inspired, authoritative, and trustworthy, a wonderful revival of true religion took place, and that a return in our day to a convinced belief in the Bible as fully inspired, authoritative, and trustworthy would bring about a similar spiritual awakening.

Dr. W. D. Lighthall offers to us in *Superpersonalism: The Outer Consciousness* (Witness Press, Montreal) his reflections on the independence of instinct and its characteristics in evolution. It is his opinion that whenever we experience the workings of instinct and the subconscious we are on the edge of a greater Consciousness; and it is his hope that he may help his readers to think of themselves as more than individuals, and to regard all questions from the standpoint of 'Superpersonalism.' The reflections here modestly set forth are based upon wide reading in science and philosophy, and are highly speculative in character. The 'Outer Consciousness' postulated by the author is no Absolute Divine Being but a biological entity—'a vast composite, living, reasoning being, of which all lesser individuals are extensions.' It makes a contribution, however, to the theistic argument.

The Sermon on the Mount.

Righteousness (Mt. vi. 1–18).

By the Reverend F. W. Norwood, D.D., London.

I have just returned from Galilee, and the spell of that sweetest of all localities is still upon my spirit.

One has a feeling that the Sermon on the Mount could never have been originally promulgated in a crowded auditorium enclosed within walls. It was preached in the open air to throngs of simple folk arrayed in bright-coloured garments, scattered over a green slope, their temples fanned by soft breezes, amid sunshine and intimate human fellowships, their eyes occasionally attracted by the flight of lightsome birds, the ripple of the wind in the grass invading their ears.

Neither is the aspect of the Preacher like that of a meticulous scribe, concerned lest he depart from the accepted authorities; it is that of a great soul moving freely amid the eternities, and the universalities and the intimacies of the cosmos. After bathing one's spirit in the atmosphere of Galilee, one understands why it came to be written: 'It came to pass, when Jesus had ended these sayings, the people were astonished at his doctrine: for he taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.'

A certain largeness of soul is necessary for an intelligent understanding of the Sermon on the Mount. Here was a Preacher speaking to the ages words which were to pass through the most searching fires of criticism and analysis throughout many centuries, yet without apparent self-consciousness, neither pompous nor ponderous, but with exquisite self-revelation, and in terms 'easily understanded of the people.'

The traditional site for the first preaching of the Sermon is the Horns of Hattim, a rugged eminence twelve miles away from Capernaum. Like most 'traditional' sites in the Holy Land it fails to sustain the conviction of reverent scholarship. It leaves us perplexed to imagine why Jesus should lead the people so far away from the scene of His manifold labours while just behind Capernaum was a hill so natural to climb, steep on the one side—a 'mountain,' as Matthew says—a gentle decline on the other—a 'plain,' as Luke calls it. At the foot of the hill also, close by the shore of the lake, is the warm spring where lepers were wont to seek for cleansing, hence one can understand how it was that 'when he was come down from the mountain, great multitudes followed him. And, behold, there came a leper and worshipped him, saying, Lord, if thou wilt, thou canst make me clean' (Mt $8^{1.2}$). Natural, too, it is to read as if immediately following, 'And when Jesus was entered into Capernaum, there came unto him a centurion' (Mt 8^{5}). From the place of preaching into the city where he dwelt it was but an easy walk.

For me, at any rate, the setting for the Sermon on the Mount is finally fixed, and is by no means without consequence. The Preacher and His natural pulpit irradiate our Lord's conception of Righteousness.

Here is a hard, and to tell the truth, a somewhat repellent word. To speak of righteousness is as if we mentioned granite. A rugged rock rises sheer out of the green soft sward. We tighten our girdle and brace ourselves for conflict. To be righteous in such a world as this is to eschew ease and comfort. It is to stand erect and to grasp one's sword. It is to say 'No' to oneself and to shoulder a cross.

Righteousness is not popular to the natural man. There are things that are softer to the touch, pleasanter to the sight, siren voices more bewitching to the ear. Men love ease and smoothness, and on their behalf need no exhortation. They only learn their need of righteousness by striking their foot against the granite rock. If righteousness be the iron framework of the world, man has discovered it reluctantly. All his life he is inclined to persuade himself that it is not really so. He would tone down its claims, soften its harshness, disguise it with festoons of beauty, obliterate it in waves of music.

The key to the understanding of history lies in the capacity of peoples or of individuals to sustain the love of righteousness. Some innate imperative compels their respect for it; some inveterate tendency makes them ever secret rebels against it. All men pay it lip-service; only rare souls love it for its own sake to the point of sacrifice.

The righteous man is usually respected, but is seldom loved by his fellows. St. Paul said sadly enough, 'Scarcely for a righteous man will one die' (Ro 5^{7}). Righteousness alone does not inspire sacrificial devotion. Men will not die for a rock, though it may stiffen their courage. They will die for a shot-torn flag or in defence of injured innocence; the best of them will follow the righteous, but only

at the cost of overcoming their innate rebellion; the less good will dislike and resist. Men are not more righteous than life compels them to be. They have never *loved* the Ten Commandments; they only accept them because of the flaming mount from which they are promulgated. If they could find some place, 'East of Suez,' where the Decalogue certainly did not apply, they would migrate thither. It is only the granite substructure of the universe that puts a curb to the waves of lawlessness. 'Blessed are they,' said the gentle Jesus, 'which are persecuted for righteousness' sake' (Mt 5^{10}). Such men have ever been the foci of resistance. The Sermon on the Mount is the last utterance in the world to sprinkle rose-water upon the hard facts of human nature.

The religious mind is the most acutely aware of this principle of contradiction. Something within makes response to this external demand. It finds the fountain of righteousness in God. It reproaches itself that the corresponding waters within the soul are so scanty, so inaccessible, so prone to disappear. It feels within itself that were there greater correspondence between the well and the fountain there would be fullness and fertility. The aim of the religious life is so to love righteousness as to secure harmony with God. True religion has always meant the exaltation of righteousness.

Jewish religion was strong in this emphasis. Its descriptive cognomen was 'The Law.' It imposed sanctions, Divine and human, upon the vacillating will, seeking to bring it to the point of harmony with the Divine nature. Righteousness became a religious word. It became (G. B. Stevens) 'rightness according to the Divine standard; conformity to the will and nature of God Himself. Since the character of God was conceived of as absolute moral perfection, righteousness in men becomes a name for that disposition and method of life which accord with God's holy will; in short, righteousness is Godlikeness.'

Such was the religion of Israel in our Lord's day at its best. But the best is never the average nor the conventional. Religion is for ever haunted with the idea of Catholicity; it seeks to extend its benefits to all men, to rest its power upon universal consent. The greater the number of men who accept it, the more are its claims supposed to be substantiated. If fifty millions subscribe to a certain form of religion, then no doubt it is the true religion, while that held by but fifty people is demonstrably false. Hence the almost universal idea that religion must rest upon some infallibility, indisputably attested, so that a man can only disbelieve by sheer moral obtuseness.

The inter-religious conflicts of the world have been waged over rival alleged infallibilities. They have seemed so clear to one party and so inadmissible to others. The present world-wide slump in religion is due mainly to the breakdown of the 'infallibilities' upon which all religions have based themselves. They are not likely to be re-established. We shall only begin to recover the religious dynamic when we return to the noble idea that true religion is at once a great quest and a great trust. God is not the President of a vast democracy, but the Sovereign Lord. Man cannot come to Him but He can come to man. Numbers are always deceptive, and nowhere more so than in religion. Conventions are always relative, and nowhere do they fall so short of the mark as in religion. True religion is always a secret compact between the soul and God. There never was a *form* of religion yet which shut in all the true and shut out all the false. The manifestly Godlike souls have belonged to all the ecclesiasticisms which the world has ever seen.

Consider the effect of this systematization of religion upon righteousness itself. It leads either to formalism or to hypocrisy.

The first tendency is to standardize righteousness. A code is agreed upon to which all are expected to conform. Inevitably it consists mainly of external observances, and these must not be beyond the reach of average humanity. We are familiar with their types and also with their futility. In recent weeks I have watched them as displayed in Islam; the repetition of set prayers, the observance of stated hours, the sterilizing of the conscience outside a limited range. What a consolidated force is there, but what a restricted orbit! Are we not equally familiar with such phenomena in Christendom? We know with comparative exactitude what is to be expected from average Christian men and women, but have become acutely aware that the real problems of this modern world lie just beyond their range. Average Christianity stops at a point which is short of the spot where real righteousness can alone save the world. It scarcely functions where economic and international realities threaten the disruption of our entire civilization. In the personal relations of men with their fellows it fails to bridge any gulfs, and is almost powerless to reconcile or save. Our accepted standardized righteousness has lost the art of redemption. It is conventional and not vital. It has little or no converting power. Christians have certain moral postures concerning the grosser sins of the flesh, but there is no contagious quality which communicates itself to the serried masses without the circle. We play

for safety rather than for victory. Like the Jews of our Lord's day, we acknowledge standards but remain stultified. Religion is not with us, as Seeley said, 'Morality touched with emotion,' but calm, calculating, frigid—and barren.

The other tendency observable in formal righteousness is, as I have said, towards hypocrisy.

Hypocrisy is almost always unconscious. Only an occasional Uriah Heep could deliberately set it before him as an objective. Men dissimulate for quite respectable reasons. Believing that certain attitudes are for the good of society or for the good of religion, they adopt them—honestly at first, and are often unaware to what an extent they have inwardly departed from them.

Righteousness which is externalized and conventionalized has a utilitarian purpose. It is intended to be an example to others. Often it is valued more as an example than as a reality. How many men set a 'good example' to their children or to their fellows which they must know is not a spontaneous revelation of their true inward state. To be efficacious, it must be 'seen of men.' This is the seed-plot of insincerity. To pray is a good thing, then why should it be furtive? Why not pray 'standing in the synagogue and in the corners of the streets'? To give alms is a good thing, then why should not a trumpet add a little additional effectiveness to the act? To fast is a good thing, then a little facial or sartorial alteration may increase its social value. Worthy citizens, not bad men at all, but quite valiantly upholding customs that were good for society, inclined to have more sympathy with their fellow-religionists of correct deportment even though their faults were well known, than with the publicans and sinners who openly flouted the observances; a tolerant eye for these and a sharp critical eye for those, but not really aware how the whole fabric of religion was being steadily undermined. Jesus called them 'hypocrites,' giving to an innocent word denoting stage-players in classics a sinister moral significance from which it has never freed itself, but one fancies that He recognized they were not utterly vulgar but shallowly devoted to 'good form.' But He also knew that righteousness makes too stern a demand upon the soul to be discharged in garments of pretence. The righteous man is a naked wrestler with the powers of evil, too absorbed in the contest to aim merely at being 'seen of men.'

Our Lord was not unconscious of the value of example. In an earlier moment He had said, 'Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven' (Mt 5^{16}), but a light shining through from within is something different from the glare of publicity thrown upon externals. Example must not be a pose but an emanation.

The key-word of the entire Sermon is 'inwardness.' Christ's view of religion was a walk with God so intimate as to take no thought for external appearances. In this section there is an emphasis upon secrecy suggestive almost of furtiveness. 'Let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth.' 'Enter into thy closet, and (even then) shut thy door, and (whisper as you) pray to thy Father which is in secret.' 'Anoint thine head, and wash thy face; that thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret.' There is a reward, but it is not an objective aimed at, only an inward state which reveals itself. It is 'seen of men' behind the back of him whose face is toward God.

Upon this basis of inward reality religion and righteousness finally rest. Here roots the only catholicity. Because Jesus is the eternal manifestation of it, He passes in and out of all the communions, a stranger to none, a captive of none. Deep souls know Him everywhere. I talked a few weeks ago with a devout Muhammadan, meticulously telling his beads as he uttered his prayers in silent intervals, who confessed that Jesus found him where Muhammad failed. In every communion, and outside them all, one gets the same confession. Religion is the soul's quest. It were better to confess it as such than to buttress up our shattered external 'infallibilities.' Religion is the soul's trust until it becomes the soul's trustworthiness.

In a significant passage in Jn $2^{23f.}$, it is said, 'many believed in his name . . . but Jesus did not commit himself unto them,' because He knew all men (ἐπίστευσαν and ἐπίστευεν). They believed in Jesus, but Jesus did not believe in them! Says Dr. Marcus Dods, 'It is necessary to consider not only whether we have faith in Christ, but whether Christ has faith in us.' Jesus believed in some men who did not believe in Him. It were better to be a man in whom Jesus could believe than merely one who believed in Jesus.

Righteousness can never be precisely defined. In New Testament language, as we have seen, it means Godlikeness. Godlikeness is as likely to issue in the defiance of standards as in their maintenance. It should make a man 'a friend of publicans and sinners' no less certainly than a 'pillar in the church.' When it is the outcome of the soul's quest and the soul's trust, it has a quality of surprise and also of redemption. It 'exceedeth the righteous-

ness of the Pharisees,' and in its strength possesses the Kingdom of Heaven.

Religion has no more deadly enemy than formalism; and formalism is 'good form' standardized and sterilized. Some one has said that the difference between a groove and a grave is mainly a matter of depth. The prophets were for ever contending against good customs that had corrupted the world. Standards change, both for better and for worse. The righteousness of one generation is either above or below the mark set by the next. God does not change, but men's thought of Him is ever in a state of flux. Progress in religion is mainly the clearing of the Divine character of the imputations cast upon it by the dark minds of men. Moral progress is the outcome of the education of the conscience. Things once accepted as either good or inevitable come to be reprobated and resisted. The consciousness of evil is as necessary for our advancement as the perception of good. Resistance is as truly a part of the devout life as acquiescence. Striving is as needful as submission.

It is not the province of religion to defend to the last errors or evils which have become intolerable to the intellect or conscience of mankind. Unless the standard of righteousness be moved forward from age to age, we may not trust in Divine providence. Challenge is inseparable from the Cross. The Cross is itself a challenge. The Sermon on the Mount is the only bit of acknowledged Christian interpretation which has survived without being encrusted by ideas and beliefs outgrown. It remains as dynamic as ever, and more and more men see in it the essence of the Faith. On a quiet hillside by Galilee Christ threw into the cauldron of the world the most inexhaustible utterance that ever found expression, and its mandate is in our day more compelling than ever before. It does not consist of excessive amiability, but of the most unflinching demand for human righteousness conceived of as service offered unto God.

A German Estimate of Contemporary British Theology.

By Professor John E. McFadyen, D.D., United Free Church College, Glasgow.

British theologians may well feel flattered at the warm appreciation of their work expressed by Professor Vollrath of Erlangen in an estimate[1] as generous as it is comprehensive. Very friendly indeed are the eyes through which he looks at them and their labours, and in his careful and trustworthy account of them there is not a breath of superiority or patronage. It is the estimate of a man who knows that, without sympathy, just and useful criticism is impossible, and who is well aware that, if Germany is endowed for the business of theology in one way, Britain is in another. Indeed, not the least fascinating part of his discussion is the contrast he occasionally draws between the two types. The German, he tells us, is an individualist—that is why he is so thoroughly at home in lyric poetry; the Britisher, on the other hand, never forgets that he is a member of a complex society—his tendency is therefore to seek a *modus vivendi*, he has a genius for compromise, and his capacity for team-work, which is illustrated so admirably in the realm of sport, is exemplified in another way in the co-operation which has gone to the making of his great Biblical Encyclopædias, or, for example, the 'Cambridge Ancient History.' The German is interested in theory and enamoured of hypotheses, the Britisher is interested in practice; he does not produce the systematic and monumental Practical Theologies of the German, because, as Vollrath acutely says, all his theology is practical theology. And this explains the wholesome and all but universal practice in Britain of appointing to theological chairs men who have been in the pastorate and who therefore know intimately and at first hand the duties and difficulties that will afterwards have to be faced by the men whom they are preparing for their life-work. The real test of the value of a theology is whether it can be preached, and, says Vollrath, a very good test it is, 'an infallible standard for every kind of theological thought and instruction.'

This practical quality, he points out, invests with peculiar value practically every British contribution to theology, alike in the field of exegetics and of theology proper; there is heard through most of it the religious note, there runs through most of it the spirit of devotion; and the German

[1] *Theologie der Gegenwart in Grossbritannien*, von Dr. Wilhelm Vollrath (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; Mk.14).

theologians in whom this blend of theology and religion is most conspicuous are the theologians whom Britain is most disposed to take to its bosom. Adolf Deissmann, for example, is welcomed because of his 'attractive combination of scholarship and spiritual feeling,' Nestle because he used to preach on Sunday to German congregations in London, Kittel because he was 'a devout churchman and former pastor.' Robertson Smith, he remarks, knew his British public, when in introducing Wellhausen's work he emphasized not only its scientific quality but its essentially, if not obtrusively, religious tone. True, he does not fail to notice that there were sections of the British public who did not take kindly to Wellhausen, but some at least of these had taken little trouble to understand him; and he quotes a characteristic sentence of Gladstone, who speaks of him as one 'whose works, on a rather slight acquaintance, I have all along mistrusted.' But he also emphasizes the splendid service rendered by Herrmann in Marburg and Harnack in Berlin in creating a genuine theological *rapprochement* between Great Britain and Germany, a verdict which many generations of British students who have studied under those great and inspiring teachers will most cordially and gratefully endorse.

No one will dispute the fact, which Vollrath does not unduly stress, that there are departments of theology in which Germany has an indubitable pre-eminence—notably Old Testament and Systematic Theology. In the former field, Britain has more or less followed in the wake of Germany, though here, too, original work has been done—Professor Welch's book on 'The Code of Deuteronomy' (James Clarke) being singled out for special mention and its argument succinctly sketched. It is further significant of our national bent of mind that, stimulated largely by Duhm's 'Theologie der Propheten,' British attention has been to a great extent concentrated on the personalities of the Hebrew prophets. In Systematic Theology again, as in Music, Vollrath tells us, we are imitative rather than creative; we are theological and we are musical, but in both departments, reproductive rather than productive. It is rather curious, too, he remarks, and not perhaps without significance, that England has no magazine exclusively devoted to Church History; but certain areas of it have been brilliantly treated by British scholars—the Reformation, for example, by the late Principal Lindsay, and Luther by Professor Mackinnon, whose second volume has just appeared.

We are not, as a people, intellectually curious. Vollrath quotes as 'very interesting' the rather caustic sentence in which Mozley offers a partial explanation of the comparatively little account taken in England of Ritschl and his doctrines: 'As a people we have many faults, but scarcely that of the ancient Athenians, anxiety either to hear or to tell some new thing.' Some of Vollrath's *obiter dicta* are very suggestive, and express thoughts which would not so readily occur to ourselves. He points out, for example, the deep significance of the familiar phrases, 'I see,' 'Look here.' The Britisher learns through his eyes, his passion is to see things; he does not, like the German, move in a world of ideas; he wants to see his ideas embodied; he believes in the visible Church, and in the League of Nations. The German scholar tends to be a man of the study, worshipping the idol of objectivity, a stranger to life and the world. Another point that strikes Vollrath as significant is the frequency of the word 'meeting.' Individuals are always 'meeting'—this illustrates the essentially social quality of the British temperament; and the individuals who meet, on platforms, for example, are often representatives of different religious denominations—this illustrates our genius for compromise and co-operation.

What strikes us most about this admirable book, full of acute observations on British ways of life and thought, is the extraordinarily high praise bestowed on book after book and scholar after scholar. Over and over again occur words like 'ausgezeichnet' (of the highest distinction), 'mustergültig' (of model excellence), 'allerersten Ranges' (in the very front rank), etc. These or similar words are applied to Professor Souter's 'Pelagius' Expositions of Thirteen Epistles of St. Paul,' Professor Milligan's 'New Testament Documents' (which, he says, ought to be translated into German), Dr. Leckie's 'The World to Come and Final Destiny,' M'Leod Campbell's 'Atonement,' Lindsay's 'History of the Reformation,' Denney's 'Jesus and the Gospel,' Professor Mackintosh's 'Doctrine of the Person of Christ,' Professor Anderson Scott's 'Christianity according to St. Paul,' Campbell Moody's 'Mind of the Early Converts,' Hastings on 'The Christian Doctrine of Prayer,' Principal Garvie's 'Ritschlian Theology,' A. E. J. Rawlinson on 'Authority and Freedom,' Professor Moffatt's Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, Charles's Commentary on Revelation, and Canon Streeter on The Four Gospels. A Scot may be pardoned for noting the prominence with which Scottish contributions to almost every department of theological science appear in this impartial estimate of contemporary British theology.

Vollrath speaks, for example, in the highest possible terms of R. S. Sleigh's book on 'The Sufficiency of Christianity' (James Clarke), a criticism of Troeltsch, the like of which, he says, Germany does not yet possess. He remarks that it represents 'the first penetrating and comprehensive study of Troeltsch not only in English but in any language'—betraying not only a sensitive approach to Troeltsch's ideas but a sturdy independence of thought.

Especially British, Vollrath remarks, is the emphasis upon the rational aspect of religion. The Britisher has little use for and little appreciation of the irrational. *Credo quia absurdum* is an idea for which 'the English Christian and theologian has no understanding.' Vollrath quotes as typical of British mentality the words of Hastings Rashdall, 'If I could not believe that Christianity is essentially rational, I could not be a Christian'; and of Dr. Leckie that it is the business of the theologian 'to show that the Gospel is a reasonable thing.' This explains the disinclination to accept Barth; the Englishman is most at home among facts and comprehensible ideas.

High praise is given to the work of British scholars in archæology, in the New Testament, where their work is more original and independent than in the Old Testament, to linguistic work, especially in the Septuagint, the investigation of the papyri, Syriac and Coptic, to the practical home mission work of the churches of all denominations, and, above all, to their splendid work on the foreign field. In this last connexion he pays a glowing tribute to the independence of the missionaries who, filled with a sense of their responsibility to preach the gospel, are not only not under the influence of political or financial motives, but are not afraid to criticise imperialistic measures of their own government or to attack the unscrupulousness of those who would exploit the natives. 'The missionaries are their friends and they know where the shoe pinches'; their knowledge of native conditions is so intimate that they are often consulted by the Government, and their achievements in the department of education, especially in India, have been of the highest value.

The three hundred and thirty-four pages of this book are not a mere catalogue of names. Not only does every page of it display an intimate acquaintance with British theological literature, but of book after book in different departments there is an adequate and often a fairly lengthy sketch. The vast material is most lucidly arranged and discussed under the following headings: (1) Science and Life, (2) Introduction to Theology, (3) Old Testament, (4) New Testament, (5) Historical Theology, (6) Leading Theologians of Germany and their Reception in England, (7) The General Contemporary Philosophical Position in Great Britain, (8) Systematic Theology, (9) Practical Theology. We have never seen a foreign book so singularly free of errors in English spelling; once or twice Kennett and Moffatt are spelt with one *t*, but our own countrymen, with less excuse, can err similarly. To the list of twenty-two errata should be added, p. 110, 'tramaic' (for 'Aramaic'), and p. 276, 'rigtheous' (for 'righteous').

It is pleasant to see the incomparable services to theological learning rendered by the late Dr. Hastings, the founder of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, through his great Dictionaries and Encyclopædia, so adequately recognized as they are in this volume. The very title of the Encyclopædia, as Vollrath justly remarks, is significant of the characteristically British interest in the ethical and practical aspect of religion. This is a book which perhaps could hardly have been written before the War. It is one of many welcome signs that Britain and Germany are really beginning not only to understand but to appreciate one another. Each has something, indeed much, to learn from the other; and while the debt of British theology to Germany is profound, it is heartening to have from a German scholar so frank and cordial a recognition of the fact that the British contribution to theological science has been anything but negligible.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Recharging the Accumulator.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

'He restoreth my soul.'—Ps 23^3.

I was listening-in one night with an excellent valve set and everything was going well. The valves glowed and the invisible waves of ether brought me beautiful voices and choice music. I settled down to enjoy myself for the evening. Suddenly the brightness of the valves faded and the music sank to a whisper, and then died into silence, and my programme had come to an untimely end! What had happened?

Of course, all you wireless experts know at once. You can talk about grid-leaks and wave-traps and variable condensers as if you had known them all your life. A whole heap of mysterious things your fathers never knew and still regard with 'respect and awful veneration' are plain-sailing to you. You know and you have already said long before I got this length, 'accumulator run down.'

Yes! that was it. What is an accumulator? Well, it's a thing that accumulates. It accumulates electric current. It makes the valves glow and do their work, choosing and encouraging the right sort of electrons and rejecting the wrong sort, and making the messages that the waves bring such that we can hear and enjoy them.

Now there are two things about an accumulator. One is that it dries up. Evaporation steals from it and brings down the level, and it must be filled up with pure distilled water, not just water from any tap, but distilled water, which is perfectly pure. The other thing is that it runs down. It loses its strength. And then it must be linked up with the power that is the light of our city, and recharged. When it is recharging you don't see anything happening at all; but you know when it is fully recharged because then it begins to fizz.

I think our souls are a kind of accumulators. They, too, dry up. The air of the world sucks the sweetness out of them, and the level of our thoughts and affections begins to sink lower and lower. Patience gets shattered and tempers snappy. We must keep up the level with the pure water of the Word of God. Any tap won't do for the accumulator; any book won't restore your soul. There are books that amuse, books that pass the time, but there is only one book which gives us the pure distilled truth that our souls need, and that is the Bible. That will restore the level, lift up our thoughts to the high level they ought to live at and never allow them to sink to levels that are low and unworthy and 'beneath us,' and that make it impossible for our souls to hear God speaking to us, and for our lives to help others to hear Him.

Our souls, too, get run down. We talk of our bodies being 'run down'; not by motor-buses, but run down like clocks, which are always running down, and which need to be regularly wound up. We forget that the same thing happens to our souls. Life every day makes big demands on our love, our patience, our sympathy, our faithfulness. Our souls get exhausted, 'run down'; and they would come to the helpless standstill of utter emptiness, if we couldn't get them recharged.

This is what we are doing when we pray. We may not get what we ask for; for God knows best, and it is for Him to give or not to give. But we get this: that we are touching the source of power and life, and our soul is being restored.

This is what we are doing when we go to church and worship God. The church is a power-house and we are recharging the accumulator. The twenty-third Psalm says, 'He restoreth my soul.' It is the same thing; we are touching the power of the Spirit of God and giving Him the chance to restore our souls and fill us with His Spirit.

It seems as if nothing is happening; just a lot of people quiet with bowed heads, or sitting at the Lord's Table, as Mary sat at Jesus' feet and listened to His words, but a great thing is happening—God is restoring their souls.

And here again it is just the same as with the accumulator. We know it is recharged when it begins to fizz, and we know a Christian is filled with the Spirit of God when he begins to fizz. The Bible doesn't say 'fizz,' but it says 'fervent,' which means 'boiling,' and it's the same thing.

I know a great many people who are far more careful about recharging their accumulators and winding up their clocks than they are about restoring their souls. I know, because, if it was not so, there would be more Christians that 'fizz,' more fervour in worship, people singing praise to God plainly because they can't help it—their hearts are so fully charged with thankfulness, more power to work, more will to give and give gladly, more religion at boiling-point ready to become steam and strength in God's service.

Girls and boys, I don't need to tell you to watch your accumulators. You have been well warned; you know that if allowed to go quite down they perish. Probably you had to pay for yours out of your own slowly saved-up pocket money. So you take care.

But I do need to tell you to watch your souls, for they too can perish, and it was Jesus Christ who paid for them on the Cross.

So when next you trudge off to get your accumulator recharged, be thinking about this other thing too: that you need to have the level of your thoughts kept up to the level of Jesus Christ; that you need to have heart and soul regularly restored and recharged, and filled with the Spirit of God, so that they will never fail.

Be constant and regular in prayer and in public worship, and your soul will be equal to all life can ask, wise to choose the voice of God from among the many voices of the world, and your hearts will glow to hear it.

Alphonse Spitfire.

By the Reverend R. A. Burrows, M.A., B.D., Duffield, Derbyshire.

'And the Lord make you to increase and abound in love one toward another, and toward all men, even as we do toward you.'—1 Th 3^{12}.

A trip to London is not for boys and girls to-day what it was when I was a boy, and I suppose there are plenty of boys and girls here who have been to London. This morning I want you to go with me in your minds through Regent's Park and visit the Zoo. There you will see all sorts of animals living very much in their natural state. But when you have seen the polar bears feed, have had a ride on the elephant, seen the giraffe stretch his long neck, and heard the lions and the tigers growl, I want you to go to a very plain building called 'The Small Cat House.' Here you will see real wild cats, some very beautiful, with tails as long as their bodies, cats that can climb up their tails. When I was last there I saw an empty cage, once the abode of a very famous cat which came to the Zoo in 1913. He was beautifully striped like a leopard, but oh, such a fierce little creature, who would spit and hiss and snap and snarl and bite worse than any dog you ever saw! Of course nobody wanted anything to do with him, and he was left quite alone. Everybody knew him as Alphonse Spitfire. One day there came to the Zoo a girl who took a fancy to Alphonse and determined to make friends with him. She little realized what a tremendous task she had undertaken, but she stuck to her task and for two years she came nearly every day to see Alphonse. Although she always brought him some little dainties, it was a very long time before she could win the confidence of Alphonse. It really came about in this way. She arrived at the Zoo one day when there was a storm raging. The wind was blowing the rain about and occasionally there would come a flash of lightning and a peal of thunder. She prevailed upon the keeper to let her enter his cage, and she was surprised at the welcome she got. Alphonse sat on her lap and remained there till the storm was over, while the girl talked to him and calmed his fears. Ever afterwards Alphonse looked forward to her coming and grew most friendly. Gradually he got to like human beings and would play with any one. Alphonse Spitfire had become Alphonse the Gentle. He now behaved himself so well that he was allowed to come out of his cage and play about the Cat House. He would sit on your arm, dive into your bag, play with you; and Alphonse, who had bitten rats in two, was allowed to get into the prams and play with the babies, and he never thought of biting them. Now you see what made all the difference. His whole character and nature had been changed by love and kindness.

Now when I heard that story I began to think of one or two little incidents where the same changes had been made in men by love and kindness, and I first thought of two men who were sent into a little village by their Master to get some food. When the people of that village knew that they were bound for Jerusalem they refused to serve them. So the two men returned to their Master and asked Him to call down fire from heaven to destroy those rude villagers. No wonder those two brothers were called 'Sons of Thunder.' Yes, but the love and kindness of their Master began to have its effect on their lives. Later, we know that one of them gave up his life because he loved his fellow-men, and the other, living to a good old age, wrote a book that the world has known ever since as the Gospel of Love. The two brothers were—who? That's right, James and John. And their Master? Yes, Jesus. And I remembered too that story of a famous Pharisee going the length and breadth of Palestine putting men and women to death and casting those whom he did not put to death into prison. Then he met Jesus on the road to Damascus, and Saul of Tarsus, Saul the Spitfire, became Paul the Gentle, the Great Apostle of the Gentiles, who gave his whole life to be spent in the service of his Master and his fellow-men.

Now there is just a little bit of Alphonse Spitfire in all of us, and we want to get rid of it. Well, we can do so. Just as we let the love of Jesus into our hearts, so can the great change be made in us. We shall become loving, gentle, and kind.

Would you like to hear, in closing, the end of the story of Alphonse? Some time ago, he caught a cold. But now he had lots of friends, and scores of them went to cheer him up. However, he grew weaker and weaker, and his oldest friend, now a young lady, went twice one day to see him. The second time she went he was lying just as he was in that storm. Quietly she crept into his cage and tenderly called 'Alphonse.' There was no answer, and again she called. She went over into his corner to stroke him, but she was too late, for the friendly little heart of Alphonse had ceased to beat. He had passed away. But what a different Alphonse from the one who twelve years before had not a friend in the whole world!

The Christian Year.

First Sunday after Trinity.

Vision and Feast.

'Then went up Moses, and Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel: and they saw the God of Israel: and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clearness . . . also they saw God, and did eat and drink.'—Ex 24^{9-11}.

'They saw the God of Israel.' The tribes had reached Mount Sinai under the leadership of Moses, their captain, their prophet. Everything was in the rudimentary stage; a nation of Israel did not yet exist; a land of Israel was still a dream. The future, destined to be so famous, lay hidden; the present was taken up with a venture, heroic indeed, but all uncertain in its issues. At this rudimentary stage, however, one thing was gloriously certain; while all else was dim, this shone clearly; no doubt remained on the one point that really mattered. The leaders of the tribes, the best minds among them—'they saw the God of Israel.'

Elsewhere in the account of what happened at Sinai we are told that the majesty of Jehovah was veiled in cloud and darkness; there was earthquake and fire and the awful tones of a trumpet; none dare approach; Moses alone went up, and he into the cloud. But here it is entirely different. Moses and the elders stand in the holy calm of the house not made with hands; and there, enthroned in glory, they saw the God of Israel.

We may take this to mean that they personally came to know God as their living Lord and King; and God vouchsafed to reveal Himself not in His overwhelming majesty, but in such a way as man could see and understand, with a Divine condescension to man's capacity. There can be no doubt that Moses had taught his tribes a new truth about God; he had impressed upon them his own high faith; and Aaron and Nadab and Abihu and the elders had responded; they had given in their assent; they had resolved to take Jehovah to be their God. But now they advance a step further in religious experience; from assent they advance to apprehension. In our own hearts we know well what this means. We say the Creed, we assent to the truths of faith with our minds as founded upon authority which we believe to be reasonable and sufficient; but we must advance beyond this if the truths of faith are to have a permanent effect upon our lives; we must advance to vital knowledge of perception.

1. 'They beheld God.' The Bible is a record of those, both men and women, who have encountered the vision of God. Isaiah saw the Lord high and lifted up; St. John saw the First and the Last and the Living One; the Incarnate Son said to His disciples, 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father also.' The Bible also declares that 'no man hath seen God at any time,' that is, God in the fulness of Godhead; 'Oh that I knew where I might find him,' cries suffering Job, 'that I might come even to his seat!' The vision of God is one of those truths which the Bible expresses by opposites; we can and we cannot see God; meanwhile we are told to endure 'as seeing him who is invisible.' He reveals Himself, and yet we know how much more there is to be revealed. This ancient narrative in Exodus is prophetic; it seems to record the first experience of that vision which is in store for all God's faithful; it carries us beyond the past and the present to that day when 'his servants shall do him service, and they shall see his face.'

2. But there is something more. 'They beheld God, and did eat and drink.' How mysterious, how significant! The vision of God is followed by the meal in His presence. We cannot help thinking of that mysterious meal in the Gospel, when the disciples saw the Risen Lord on the shore of the lake in the early morning, and He bade them 'Come, break your fast.' This meal on the mountain was a sacrament of fellowship. According to early custom, men ate and drank together as a sign that they had made a covenant. But here the covenant is made between God and man,

Moses and the elders celebrated a solemn meal of communion; and however crudely primitive their idea may have been, we may be sure that as they ate and drank in God's presence they realized God's fellowship with them in a new way; they entered into a new relation with Him; henceforth He was their God and they His servants. Again we feel that there is something prophetic in the narrative; it points on to the blessing in store for those who are 'bidden to the marriage supper of the Lamb.'

3. It is to be noticed that the Vision and the Feast are brought into connexion with the giving of the Law. The personal apprehension of a personal God realized by heart and conscience involves a new relation with God, and this again carries with it practical consequences in life and conduct. Nothing can be more practical than a right knowledge of God. The Vision and the Covenant issue in laws of worship and moral duty; that is why the religion of Israel became a new force in the world. A religion which combined high thoughts of God with a binding moral sense, whose God exacted the homage of moral service, contained, even in its rude beginnings, an element of permanence and growth. Hence it came about that the wandering tribes, led and taught by Moses, won their way at last to a settled home, and by degrees imposed themselves upon a superior civilization, and in spite of frequent failures still held their own, and even out of disaster sprang into new vigour, and tightened their grasp of the truth and handed it on, until the ancient faith was taken up into a fuller revelation.

For us an imperishable significance dwells in the old prophetic story. True religion is the personal apprehension of God, known and perceived as our living Father, Saviour, Lord: 'they saw the God of Israel.' And to know God in this vital sense is to enter into a new relation of fellowship with Him: 'they beheld God, and did eat and drink.' And thus united with Him and with one another, we come down to face the tasks and duties of life strengthened to obey the Law of Him whose service is perfect freedom.[1]

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Faith and the Social Problem.

'The kingdom of heaven is at hand.'—Mt 4^{17}.

Every age and country have their own particular perplexities. It is not difficult to indicate some of the causes of the problems which confront us in our land to-day. They are the increase of population during the last century; the conditions of land tenure; the emergence of the industrial State, its antagonism of interests, its severing of the personal link between employer and employed, its enslavement of mind by matter, its conditions of life and labour and its irregularity of employment. These are the facts and factors to which we must turn our attention if we would discharge our duty to society.

1. *We must face the facts and try to bring them home to others.*—Social problems are very intricate and complex, and uninstructed enthusiasm may do more harm than good. We are to love God and our neighbour with all our mind as well as with all our heart. Enthusiasm must be informed and directed by knowledge. Then, having grasped the facts and their significance, we must become apostles, charged with the mission not merely of illuminating the minds but of awaking the consciences of others. Part of the prevailing indifference to social evils springs from ignorance, part from a feeling that the possibilities of improvement are strictly limited. There are many who have little hope of the regeneration of the multitude, and who regard destitution and slums as inevitable elements in the social order. It is our privilege and responsibility to kindle faith where there is little or none, and to burn the facts into the consciences of men.

Moreover, the study of social problems needs to be humanized. We must remember that we are dealing, not with abstract principles and relations, but with men, women, and little children, and the conditions under which they live and work. Behind the tables and curves and charts of the sociologist is the throbbing mass of humanity—tempted, sinning, sorrowing, suffering, struggling, and striving. In the last analysis we are dealing not with things but with men. And we cannot play with men as we play with pawns. They have minds and hearts and wills and consciences. They think and feel and aspire as we do. The social problem is not merely an intellectual but a human problem.

The corollary to this is that to knowledge and sympathy we must add service. It is the peculiar peril of those who are engaged in intellectual pursuits that they are apt to imagine that their cause is won when they have proved its reasonableness, and to forget that the forces of inertia, prejudice, and selfishness can be broken down only by persistent and self-sacrificing personal service. It is not enough to cherish great ideas and ideals. If they are to achieve anything, we must embody them in action in our varied spheres of life. The en-

[1] G. A. Cooke, *The Progress of Revelation*, 15.

thusiasm for humanity is one thing ; the enthusiasm for the individual man is quite another. It is fatally easy to cry out for the uplifting of humanity, and at the same time to shrink from contact with the individual man who needs uplifting. The world asks of scholars two things : a service that is reasonable, and a reason that is serviceable ; work made intelligent, and intelligence set to work.

2. *We must moralize social relations.*—During the last hundred years intellectual progress has outstripped moral progress. There has doubtless been an advance of moral enlightenment, but an increase of moral energy and power is not so obvious. The nineteenth century was an era in which Natural Science progressed by leaps and bounds. Some of Nature's most closely guarded secrets were wrested from her, and almost every year brought new discoveries, inventions, and machines. Science has bestowed on us many great and precious gifts. But there is another side to the account. Science has given us the industrial era, and there are many accompaniments of industrialism of which none of us is proud. It is a good thing that men have invented machinery, but it is a bad thing that it has been used not to lighten toil, but to add to it—not to liberate the powers of man's personality, but to degrade men into living machines. It is a good thing that industry has been organized and that the prosperity of the country has been built on sound foundations, but industrialism has brought with it certain attendant evils which are not necessary—slums, sweating, extremes of wealth and poverty, class strife, the ethics of the Manchester School, the deification of wealth and the materialization of the standards of life. If we are not careful, machinery will drive us instead of our driving it. Our intellectual achievements outstrip our moral achievements.

That is where the unmoralized intellect leads us. We cannot build up a new society on scientific categories alone. The intellect must be moralized. We need a strength which is not our own if the spirit of man is to triumph over the blind forces which the intellect has liberated. We must bring 'every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ.'

3. *We must emphasize the fact that the ideal social order can only be built on spiritual foundations.*—In the last analysis, all our problems, social and international, are problems of the mind and heart and will. We cannot solve them unless we can produce a fundamental change in human nature. If Capital and Labour would both act on the Golden Rule they would find a straight path out of their difficulties. But the change of heart is the most difficult change to accomplish. All history proves that it can only be achieved by spiritual forces. There is no hope for society apart from the redemptive and transforming power of the gospel of Christ. This does not mean that we must fall back on the argument, 'Get individuals converted, and things will right themselves.' Thousands of individuals have been converted, and things have not righted themselves. What it means is that the regenerating forces of the gospel must be more fully organized for social ends, and that we must give ourselves more intelligently and earnestly to the pursuit of Christ's ideal of the Kingdom of God on earth.

But why is it that we care at all about social reform? Why should we disturb ourselves? Are pity and a love of justice motives with sufficient constraint to impel us to set our hands perseveringly to this task? The history of the world would seem to indicate that they are not. Our zeal for social reform springs from our recognition that all men have a spiritual nature. Because we all have immortal souls, we all have a right to a share in shaping the environment in which our souls have to live and grow.

When democracy appeals to the soul, it is building on sure foundations for just dealing and mutual respect between all classes of the people. The clever may despise the stupid and the learned the ignorant, but not when they realize that those whom they scorn have immortal souls. The rich man may grind the faces of the poor. He may exploit their labour, call them 'hands,' and treat them as cogs in a soulless machine. But he is bound to change his attitude when he awakens to this fact. A man's moral sense is utterly dead if he can treat men as machines, when he knows them to be souls.

We speak of our rights and our liberties—rights and liberties which are ours by nature. But we have no rights or liberties except those which we can win and hold with our strong right arm, unless we have souls. Why should not the strong oppress the weak? Why should not those who know exploit those who do not know? The only conclusive answer is, because, in the sight of God, rich and poor, strong and weak, learned and ignorant, are of equal potential value, and equally capable of eternal fellowship with God and of growth into His likeness.

Wordsworth, writing of the early days of the French Revolution, said :

> Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive,
> But to be young was very Heaven !

The same may be said to-day in spite of the thick clouds that encompass us. We are living in days of great opportunity. There are epochs in human history when ideas and institutions are fluid. The way is open to remould them. If men let the occasion slip ideas become stereotyped again, and the opportunity may not soon recur. We are living in such an era. Social ideas and institutions are in the melting-pot, and the world 'reconstruction' is on every one's lips. Once more we have a supreme opportunity of refashioning society. Let no one imagine that the task is easy. The forces of selfishness and reaction will rally and organize and fight a desperate battle for old theories and systems. It is for us to take up the challenge, to throw ourselves whole-heartedly into the fray, and to seize this opportunity of branding on the fabric of the social order the marks of the Lord Jesus.[1]

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Dilemma at Jordan.

'Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him. But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to me? And Jesus answering, said unto him, Suffer it to be so now: for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness. Then he suffered him.'—Mt 3^{13-15}.

The time was now ripe. After the long years of quiet preparation—a gracious boyhood and a clean stretch of working manhood, with many long thoughts and wonderings that must remain a sealed book to us—the soul of the Redeemer was stirring in the life of the Man. The mysterious bidding of God was working in Jesus to a clear issue and a great adventure. And so our Lord steps clear on to the stage of His ministry, as if He had just come straight from the presence of God. It is a spiritual gain to us that He has no past. Let us leave those thirty years to Himself, for they belong only to Him and to God. Surely the world has more than it can ever grasp or understand in the three rich years of His active ministry.

At this moment He feels the thrill of His new-found gifts. God's whisper has roused Him to a knowledge of two things—His work and Himself. Of the two it may well be that the discovery of Himself is the greater, for by it the other was conditioned. We cannot know how or when it came, though we may well hazard the suggestion that John's clear message of the Kingdom served as one of the prongs of awakening. But we do know that the call has come—at last. A sense of His own greatness stirs in Him—a unique conception of His mission based on a unique conception of Himself. It is Christ's uniqueness, majestically felt in His own heart, which creates this dilemma at Jordan.

If the crusade of John was purely a Baptism of Repentance, Jesus, whom no person could convict, could not accept. He acknowledged sin to no man. This is a clear note of His own consciousness. He is the only man in history who never acknowledged sin without being called a hypocrite or a self-deceiver. How, then, would a pure soul like Jesus treat the Baptism of John? There were one or two courses open to Him which might have agreed with His uniqueness, and in human eyes might even have seemed to enhance it.

(1) So far as He Himself was concerned, He might have said, 'This ministry of repentance is salvation for these needy people, but, of course, it cannot in any way apply to Me. By God's love, I come to My great work with a stainless heart. Having nothing to confess, I need no cleansing tears.'

(2) Or, He might have advanced further and argued, on the positive side, that though John's ministry had served its own day superbly, yet since He Himself had now appeared, its day was done. John's preaching was a beautiful relic of the past—the past that was now swallowed up for ever in the glorious present. The Baptist had only foretold that the Kingdom was coming: Jesus announced that at last the Kingdom had come. Thus in a quiet but assured way, He might have brushed John's baptism aside, as an obsolete thing, good in itself no doubt, but now finally superseded. The Prince's herald retires when the Prince appears.

(3) Or again, with His own soul hot with God's full vision, He might not only have neglected John's Baptism, but might easily have opposed and decried it. In His eyes, admittedly, that ministry of John was an imperfect thing. It was a great half-truth. It proclaimed only aspects of God and aspects of sin. Is it not our duty to smash imperfect things, lest they lure simple souls from the biggest and the best?

What did He do?

Bidding His mother and brethren farewell, He walked out of Nazareth one summer morning along the dusty ways and through the scrubby hills, making for the pools of Jordan. He joined the throng of troubled seekers whose anxious feet had beaten paths like sheep-tracks through the rough country. He mingled with this pilgrim mob until they brought Him to the motley concourse at the river. There He stayed all day, watching with

[1] H. M. Hughes, *Faith and Progress*, 222.

His loving eyes this great sacrament of a people's awakening and cleansing. Then, as twilight gathered and the weary people trudged homewards —some, praise God, with lighter hearts—Jesus, 'when all the people were baptized,' went up to John.

Quietly, and yet with a note of authority, He asked to be baptized. There, alone with the silent stars, He faced the weary preacher. 'Sir, I would be baptized of thee.' To John's shamed protest that he should presume to baptize Jesus, our Lord made a reply that is now one of the great sentences of literature. 'It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.'

Why did He do it?

(1) At the outset, with serious purpose, He thereby aligned Himself with everything He knew to be good. He greeted God whenever He saw His shadow. For Him, without doubt, this Baptism of John had serious faults: it was far from perfect. But on the other hand, it was the one thing in that age that stood out unmistakably for God and good. So He quietly overlooked the defects in it that were personal to Him, and publicly identified Himself with this crusade for righteousness. We find in this gracious guidance.

Take, for instance, the modern Church. It is a broken thing, so broken that many a passer-by reviles it openly. It may have gold in it—no doubt it has—but sometimes we see only a mighty mass of dross. The shortcomings, the failures, the open contradictions, the meagreness of our love and life, the wretched contrast between profession and practice—sometimes, as we look at the Church, we see only its ghastly shortcomings. What shall we do with it, then? Stand outside and shake its dust from our feet? Or shall we line up like Jesus, knowing all its imperfections, but knowing also that it is the one clear thing in this bleak world of ours that stands for God and goodness? Like Him, shall we take our part in it even though we could criticise it? But may it not be the big thing, and the Christian thing, simply to enter in and take our saving share in its work?

(2) He aligned Himself with everything that was evil and worthless. The evil of the world—especially in that thing we call *sin*—is gathered up in us. When Jesus stepped into Jordan, He ranged Himself by our side; for He joined Himself to the great company of the afflicted people of His day. He entered into a glorious community, a solidarity, with such broken and defeated souls as we are.

This is one aspect of the Baptism which no wise man will dare forget. It shows us in a wonderful symbolism the quality of the Lord we serve. What shall we call this gracious act? It is the *identity of sympathy*. The genius of true sympathy is that it stands, humbly and fully, where its object stands. Our Lord did this. Do we? A sense of uniqueness always separates. We stand apart in our lordly greatness. But Christ's greatness only led Him to identify Himself with us. It is true that He entered into our experiences in all ways; but this deed at the river is His greatest act of identity.

(3) Again, in this act Jesus linked Himself definitely with all the honourable past. John was the last of the prophets. He was of the order of Elijah and Amos, and, in message and methods alike, he was of their caste.

With new light in our hearts, it is so easy, so tempting, sometimes so cheap, to condemn the past. In our modern literature, every young callow Georgian discourses with a sneer of the age of Queen Victoria. In fact, we all speak patronizingly of the past, until it is sufficiently past. Then when it becomes decrepitly ancient, we fall on our knees and worship it!

Jesus had a better right than any to say, 'The best things in the past are now swept out. I begin a new era. In order to show how new and searching My message is, I should treat John as if he were an anachronism.' He might have said that. Instead, He linked Himself publicly with this last of the prophets. In asking for the benediction of John's Baptism, He linked Himself with every good thing that men had struggled for through days of sorrow and blunder. We would learn from the Master this beautiful secret.

(4) Still further, our Lord's act is a gracious benediction on every good convention, and a recognition of all customs or rites that exhibit a bit of God. We think that the more original a man is, the more should he be expected to despise ordinary ways and strike out on lines of his own. Indeed, we regard it as a mark of 'bigness' that a man should be unconventional. It may be equal to a revelation sometimes to shake ourselves out of ancient and accepted modes, otherwise life would be dominated, and cursed, by convention. Yet we cannot but think that every good man should seriously consider his relation to all established practices and canons of conduct. It is so easy, and so foolish, to despise them. But it may be a bigger and finer thing to honour good observances than to imagine ourselves beyond them. It was a mark of greatness even for such an original soul as Jesus to say, 'It becometh us to fulfil all righteousness.' We soon learn that life runs, and

must run, in conventions; and if a convention lives at all, it is because it has some real contribution of goodness hidden in its heart. In mock superiority shall we kick these things aside? We do not need them perhaps—but do others? All strong men show the quality of their strength by remembering those who are lame.[1]

Fourth Sunday after Trinity.

Charity.

'Beloved, let us love one another: for love is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love. In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only-begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. . . . Beloved, if God so loved us, we ought also to love one another.'—1 Jn 4^{7-11}.

If we set ourselves steadily to consider the Christian way—the principles of Christian living—two virtues or qualities present themselves as fundamental, pre-eminent, and essential. Humility is the first, and the second is charity or love—the two words being but the different translations in our familiar English Bible of the one Greek word 'agape,' which was a word, one may almost say, coined or minted in the Christian Church—the most distinctively Christian word.

There have been days when men found it possible to talk about the principle that God is love, and the consequent duty of loving all men, as a sort of commonplace. But those days have gone by. Intellectually we recognize to-day how difficult it is to believe that the Force which lies behind, and works throughout, the development of the universe is pure and unqualified love. And when we talk to sincere people about the consequent duty of loving all men, we find that to most it presents itself as something that is impracticable. They know—or think they know—what love is. They love some people and not others; that is, they like some, and they dislike others. But the root of their mistake is that they think of love as a matter of emotion or feeling.

Christian love is deliberate correspondence with the declared purpose and mind of God. The root Christian principle, incomparably the most difficult, and also the most attractive, of Christian dogmas or doctrines, is the doctrine that God is love; which is not an obvious truth by any means, but is the central point of that positive self-disclosure of God which the Bible conveys to us, and the central meaning of the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ. The meaning of the Incarnation is that the real character of the being who made and rules the world has been for us translated out of that difficult and unintelligible region of abstract things beyond our sight into the intelligible lineaments of a human character which all can understand, the character of Jesus of Nazareth.

'No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.' We cannot fail to note that He continually emphasizes one thing as the supreme and all-essential truth, and it is that God is the Father of all alike, which is what St. John expresses in the phrase 'God is love.'

If the ultimate law of the universe, the law of the very being of God who made the world, is love—if that is creation's final law—then every reasonable person must perceive that he has one summary duty, which is to correspond with the purpose of the world or the summary law of Nature. For the ultimate folly is to be out of harmony with the fundamental law of being. Every one knows that. And just as lust or pride puts us out of harmony with the purpose of the world, so exactly in the same sense selfishness, class narrowness, jealousy, malevolence, indifference—these things allowed to become characteristic of our lives—put us utterly out of harmony with God and with His purposes for us.

1. The first beginning of real deliberate Christian living is steadily to contemplate what God is; and to resolve that our lives are going to be deliberately so lived as to be in harmony with God. Is our thought of heaven and hell? Well, heaven is communion with God; and hell is to be out of fellowship with God; and there is no possibility of evading the conclusion that to suffer a character of selfishness to be built up within us, or in that most expressive phrase of Isaiah, to 'hide myself from mine own flesh'—to let the natural advantages of wealth or position screen us from the sufferings of the average man—that is deliberately to build up a character out of harmony with God. Selfishness or indifference is hell self-made within us. And on the other hand, the acceptance of the Christian law of love is the realization that we must be in harmony with the law of the universe or the being of God, and the being of God is love.

2. Let us go on to emphasize the breadth and universality of this quality of Divine love; because in a sense we all love. We love our friends, our relations, our families; we all have a natural sympathy with our class; there is a sphere within which we respond easily to the demand of those who are

[1] J. Black, *The Dilemmas of Jesus*, 9.

about us. But the point is that this sort of natural predilection, natural love, is exclusive, it is narrow; it has natural sympathies, and it has natural antipathies, and it has almost indomitable prejudices. There is nothing to choose between class and class in this respect, or between nation and nation; they all have their loves, and they have their hatreds, their sympathies, and their suspicions.

The question whether the structure of our civilization is to totter and fall seems to be at bottom the question whether men will return to recognize and seek to obey the law of God, or how many men in our society which calls itself Christian will seriously do this. If not, as the prophets and our Lord tell us, we must fall under judgment.

But, of course, it is not merely a public question; it is a private question also. St. John would have us test ourselves rigidly in the matter; and our sincerity is to be tested not by our abstract assertion of principles, but by our manner of dealing with individuals in want or those whom we do not like, or those who have done us some serious wrong. For observe, it is a matter of act or will and not of feeling. Some one has done us a wrong. But do we take pains to understand what God's thought and intention are for him, and what God would have him be? If so, we may have to be severe, but the severity will be utterly purged from the motive of revenge, or the desire to see him suffer. It will become simply an expression of the pure good-will of God.

3. And then, lastly, we are to see the principle of love as it is set before us in Jesus Christ. We see in His life and teaching that love means active service according to our opportunities; that we must eradicate out of the very foundations of our being the idea that we are justified in living to enjoy ourselves. We live for service. He does not guarantee us against suffering, even the extremest suffering. By this we are to mark the reality of our service, that we are ready to suffer. But we think wrongly if we allow ourselves in any way to be tinged with what is a purely pessimistic and not a Christian doctrine, that there is any value in pain for its own sake. If we look at the life of Jesus Christ we shall notice the fact that out of the thirty-three years of His mortal life, thirty years were passed in what was human happiness.

The pain of Jesus deepening into anguish, deepening into the Cross, came solely out of the double root of obedient service and sympathy. Granted the resolute will of obedience, the resolute self-equipment for service, granted a large-heartedness of sympathy which refuses to be bound by the limits of family or class, there will be abundant joy in life. Indeed, a well of fresh-springing joy has been opened, and it will be in the providence of God to settle how much of suffering shall come upon us.

The point from which we began and at which we end is the challenge that Christ offers to a man that he should organize his life to co-operate with the wide love of God, and not let it drift. Let us organize our lives on the basis of the mind of God; and we know what God is, as we see Him in the face of Jesus Christ. The mind of God, the mind of Him who made and rules the world, is the mind of love that is universal and without qualifications; and in this and no other way shall all men know that we are children of God and Christ's disciples, if we have love one to another.[1]

[1] C. Gore, *Christian Moral Principles*, 62.

The Origin of the Hebrews: A Suggestion.

By Lieut.-Col. K. L. Stevenson, Scarborough.

The traveller from Basra to Baghdad, by rail, leaves Makina Station, Basra, at 10 p.m. At about 8 a.m. the following morning the train reaches Ur Junction, halts for an hour while the engine is watered, and the passengers partake of breakfast in the restaurant. Two miles away, to the west of the line, rises the extensive mound of Tel Mugheir, covering the ruins of Ur of the Chaldees, and dominated by the ziggurat, or stage-tower, of the great temple of Sin, the Moon-god.

The country round is uncompromising, waterless desert, as flat as the sands at Shoeburyness, and destitute of any vegetation whatsoever. It is not a cheering prospect; but if the traveller gazes past the southern end of the mound of Ur, he may distinguish faintly, on the horizon, the pointed summit

of the ziggurat at Tel Abu Shahrain, the mound which covers the ruins of Eridu, the city of mystery.

The journey across this stretch of desert may easily be made by motor-car, though the tribes in the vicinity are uncertain and not inclined to be friendly. On approaching the mound, while still some two or three miles off, one meets a sharp depression in the ground surface, which continues until one is quite near to the upstanding mass of Tel Abu Shahrain, when one re-ascends to the original desert level. On the left hand may be seen what look like bluffs or cliffs, having all the appearance of a coast-line, though the sea is now more than 100 miles away. It is quite evident that this was once the broad estuary of the Euphrates, and that Eridu lay upon its right bank, near to the mouth. Indeed, we find from the cuneiform records that in 2400 B.C. Eridu was a seaport. Since then the Euphrates has silted up and changed its course, so that its nearest point is now 18 miles away: while the sea has receded year by year, leaving the surrounding country dry and waterless.

Although Ur was a city of immense antiquity, Eridu was even more ancient still. It was never one of the cities of royalty. Had it been more extensively excavated we should know more about its history; but we never read of it as sending forth conquering armies, or exercising dominion over the cities round about. It was a holy city, a city dominated by the priestly element, given up to the rites and sacrifices of religion; a place of mysterious sanctity, the origin of which has not yet been fathomed. It was the boast of kings and rulers, when they held the sovereignty, that they had 'cared greatly for Eridu'; and the temple of Ea, the city god (who was named Enki by the Sumerians), was pre-eminently the shrine of oracle, where rulers would go for advice before undertaking an important work or campaign, Ea being the god of knowledge of good and evil. In the cuneiform records Eridu is stated to have been the first of the antediluvian cities to be built in the country. In the Ashmolean there is a list of these cities, where the original name is given as Khabur; and Professor Langdon has identified this with Eridu.

In his book, *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments*, Professor Sayce tells us that Eden was the ancient name of the 'field,' or plain, of Babylonia, and suggests that Eridu was the site of the Garden. It does not resemble, at present, one's conception of Paradise: a more desolate-looking mound it would be difficult to imagine; but lack of water soon converts fertile soil into a desert. Although by no means a learned scholar, I venture to agree with him, for the following reasons:

(1) Since we now know that at least 100,000 years ago, possibly much earlier, the earth was inhabited by men with nearly as high a bodily development as we possess at present, it is impossible to take the story of Adam and Eve literally. The alternative is to regard it as an allegory. But most of these ancient legends, which have persisted, seem to have been founded on historical facts, which tend to gather transcendent details as they pass from mouth to mouth down the centuries, especially in the East. If we assume that Adam and Eve represent the earliest Semitic settlers, it becomes significant that Eridu is always stated to have been the very first of the antediluvian cities built in the country. The river, that went forth out of Eden to water the Garden, should then be the Euphrates.

(2) The cuneiform ideograms, that were used to denote these cities, are very ancient. It is reasonable to suppose that the picture they represent has some bearing upon the original foundation of the city. That for Eridu is written thus:

At first sight this does not much resemble a garden; but any visitor to Iraq may see them by the score at any village along the river bank. The cuneiform marks are lines, which take this shape when the four-sided stylus is pressed edgeways into the soft clay, before baking. The thick vertical line, on the right, represents the main stream of the river; the long, narrow, horizontal one—the irrigation channel; and the small vertical lines—the subsidiary ditches dividing off the separate fields. Here you have the plan of a watered garden in the East, which can only be made fertile through irrigation.

As a corroborative detail—the mound of Eridu stands upon the right bank of the dry, silted-up channel of the Euphrates. The garden of the ideogram is also on the right bank.

(3) Ea, the city god of Eridu, was the god of the water. 'E' means a house, and 'a' the water. *Ea* = the house of the water. Water is the best of Divine gifts in a rainless country. Consider how important a part the sacredness and mystery of water has played in the religion of the Christian and the Jew! The Bible is full of it from end to end. Many of the miracles described in the Scriptures are connected with water. There is the Holy Water of the Catholic, and the Water of

baptism, and many other sacred uses for this element. Is it not possible that the origin of the sacredness and mystery of water lies in the worship of Ea, the god of the water, one of the oldest religions known?

Dumu means 'a son' in Sumerian, the language that introduced cuneiform writing.
Adumu is, then, 'the son of the water,' or 'the son of Ea.' I would suggest that Adumu and Adam are identical.
Belu is a Semitic word meaning 'Lord.'
Abelu, 'The Lord of the water,' or 'Ea is Lord.'
But Abelu = Abel.

(4) Then again, the character of Ea is unique, and a marvellous conception for such a primitive period, when one would expect mankind to be in a state of savagery, and their ideas about God only crude and warlike even if they had a veneer of civilization.

Ea is the creator, making the dry land appear, and dividing it from the swamps. He is the friend of man, giving him all that makes life pleasant and desirable. He is the saviour and protector who, braving the wrath of the most high god, plans the escape of Atrakhasis, the survivor of the Flood. It is he who heals men of their diseases, casting out noxious demons, and bringing health and peace: who inspires mankind to great deeds by his fatherly advice and counsel. In the story of Adapa he endeavours to secure immortality for mankind. It is Ea who endows the ruler with intelligence, as it is he who presides over the fine arts, instructing men in architecture, in working precious metals and stones, and in all the expression of man's intellectual activity. Thus Ea may be defined as the god of progress and civilization; it is to him that one turns when other gods seem hostile.[1] A wonderful conception of God for such a primitive age. Surely there is revelation here, and a groping of mankind towards the knowledge of God the Father.

(5) And lastly, there is a clinching argument, if it be conceded, connecting Ea and Eridu definitely with the Hebrew religion.

It was a custom amongst these early peoples to write certain important words or names in one way, and to invert the characters when pronouncing them. Thus:

Sin, the Moon-god, the city god of Ur, was written *En-zu*.
Lu-gal, the Sumerian word for a king, was written *gal-lu*.
Gibil, the Fire-god, was sometimes written *Bilge*.
Apsu, the deep, was written *zu-ab* (*E-apsu* was the name of the temple of Ea in Eridu).
Atrakhasis, the survivor of the Flood, was sometimes written *Khasis-atra*, or, in later times, *Xisuthros*; and so on.

If this custom were applied to the name of Ea, there is only one way of pronouncing it euphonically, and that is Jahveh; and Jahveh, or Jehovah, was the tribal god of the Hebrews.

Indeed, it seems natural to think that the inhabitants of Khabur, the antediluvian name of Eridu, should call themselves 'the Khabiri,' or should be known by such a name. In later years, during the reign of Amenhotep IV. of Egypt, the latter emerge from obscurity in connexion with the conquest of Palestine, and have been identified with the Hebrews. They are mentioned in the Tel el-Amarna letters.

I have been drawing inferences from well-known facts, and propose to take it as a working hypothesis that Eridu was originally the Garden, eastward in Eden, and that its primitive inhabitants were the root-stock of the Hebrew nation. With this for a foundation let us endeavour to follow out the likely course of events from the meagre information available, and, in doing so, I shall not hesitate to use my imagination to a certain extent, where necessary. Professional archæologists are, perhaps naturally and rightly, desperately afraid of giving any scope to their imaginations; but since I have no archæological reputation to lose, I am indifferent to the pointed finger, provided that I can reach a glimmer of the truth.

The clash between the primitive Semitic settlers and the Sumerian horde arriving from the East is, I think, quite obviously pictured in the story of Cain and Abel. The Semites were keepers of sheep, while the Sumerians were husbandmen. To judge from the stone hoes, flint chips, and clay sickles of great antiquity, found in abundance at Tel Abu Shahrain by Campbell Thompson in 1918, the culture of these early settlers was primitive, and belonged to the Stone age. The Sumerians were much more highly civilized. They possessed a knowledge of metals, were acquainted with the use of bricks for building purposes, and brought with them a system of writing of their own. The Semites, therefore, had no chance in the contest; the result was a foregone conclusion. After all, the allegory of Cain and Abel was Semitic, and told from the Semitic point of view. The conclusion of the Garden story seems to suggest that the

[1] Jastrow, *Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria*.

Khabiri were evicted from their beloved city of reed huts by their conquerors, and passed into a condition of servitude; digging the soil, in the sweat of their brows, for their new masters. This sudden change in their circumstances must have been terrible to such lovers of freedom, and, with their profound religious instinct, they would find the cause in that they had sinned against their god Ea. Perhaps they had committed some grievous sin against the light as they saw it, and this was their punishment.

Why should not the city of Ur be represented by the cherubims with flaming sword? It lies twelve miles north-east of Eridu, and would have guarded effectively any approach to the Garden from the east; especially since, at this early period, the country round must have consisted mostly of low-lying swamps. The cherubims were placed to the east of the Garden.

In the series of cuneiform characters used to denote Ur is found the following peculiar and primitive ideogram:

The horizontal part could hardly be a barbed arrow at this early period; but it might represent a weapon with flames radiating from its point. The cross-guard for the hilt has been a comparatively modern invention in swords.

I admit that it requires some ingenuity to identify the two little superimposed triangles as the cherubims; but it is not straining the imagination unduly to detect the representation of a ziggurat, or stage-tower, of an ancient city, whence the watchman could espy with ease any furtive son of Ea creeping back to the Garden that he loved. A new significance would be given to the name Ur Kasdim (Ur of the Conquerors).

Let us suppose that the Khabiri, after their eviction from the Garden city, were set by their conquerors to build the city of Ur (as their descendants were forced, in later years, to build the treasure cities of Pithom and Raamses), and that a colony of them remained as inhabitants of Ur down the centuries, entering into the life around them, but holding secretly the closely guarded tradition of their wonderful Garden city. No other record of the Garden story has been found but that told in the Hebrew Scriptures. It is tempting to think that the origin of the reversal of the characters, mentioned above, was an attempt to keep secret the name of their god by an anagram; and that when the secret was let out, and this custom became fashionable, that the everlasting name was not used at all, the title of 'The Lord' being substituted for it. Possibly the Sumerians named the god of Eridu—Enki (the Lord of the Land), because, while anxious to worship the local deity, in accordance with their usual policy, they did not at first know his name, and the Khabiri would not divulge it.

Here in Ur the Hebrews would learn their first lessons in patience and adaptability, which have been characteristic of the race down the ages. It always seems to have been their fate, or God's plan for the world, that they should be dispersed amongst their enemies, while still holding tenaciously to the religion of their fathers. Their affections also would remain concentrated on a city, dear and wonderful beyond imagination, which has remained one of their strongest instincts for all time; living, from century to century, in a sublime faith that it would one day be restored to them, and that they should once more worship Jahveh in peace and freedom in their own promised land.

When Abram lived at Ur its glorious days were over, its power on the decline. He appears to have been a man of some importance in the city, and to have possessed much wealth. Eridu had been a Sumerian city for many centuries, and there seemed to be no hope that it would ever be anything else. Even the worship of Ea had been taken up by the Sumerians, and thoroughly Sumerized. The kingdom of Babylon, which had recently arisen, had no sympathy with Hebrew ideals, and her priests were more concerned with establishing the position of their god Marduk in the Pantheon than in acknowledging the supremacy of Ea. Then the call came to Abram and found him ready. He went forth in faith to find the promised land that his God would give him, where his nation should become great: and a new city, that should be God's own city for all time, where Jahveh Himself would dwell.

The whole story seems to connect up beautifully and logically, and fits in remarkably well with the dominant characteristics of the Hebrew nation. It provides the theme for an epic not unworthy of a modern Milton.

Contributions and Comments.

The Meaning of עֹרֶף in Leviticus v. 8.

The words ממול ערפו in Leviticus 5^8 have always offered difficulties to commentators. If עֹרֶף means 'neck' and מול means 'in front of,' what then is the sense of 'in front of the neck'? Which part is the front of the neck? The meaning of ממול is therefore given as 'off the front of, *i.e.* close in front of' (see Gesenius-Brown's *Lexicon*, p. 557). But מול means simply 'in front of,' 'facing.' The difficulties of the usual, forced interpretation of ממול ערפו are also reflected in the Rabbinic Literature (see Levy, *Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch*, vol. iii. pp. 135 and 136).

On reading again Lv 5^8 in connexion with *Ḥullin* 19^b (in the Babylonian Talmud) it occurred to me that ערף in this verse might have a technical, an anatomical meaning, that it might denote a certain bone in the neck of the bird. This assumption, it seems to me, is very much strengthened by the translation of this word in the Septuagint. And I venture to suggest that the translation given in the Septuagint holds the key to the understanding of these two words. The Septuagint translate ממול ערפו by *ἀπὸ τοῦ σφονδύλου*. The word *σφόνδυλος* occurs often in Hippocrates and has the meaning of 'a vertebra,' especially 'one of the cervical vertebræ,' properly the second (see Liddell-Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*, p. 1513). It is worthy of note that Lv 5^8 is the only passage in the OT where the Septuagint translate ערף with *σφόνδυλος*. In all the other places in the Bible, in which ערף occurs, the Septuagint translate ערף by other words, as *αὐχήν* (several times), *νῶτον* (several times), and *τράχηλος* (many times). Only in Lv 5^8 the Septuagint give for ערף *σφόνδυλος* (see Hatch and Redpath, *A Concordance of the Septuagint*, p. 1327, *s.v.*). Why have the Septuagint given here the word *σφόνδυλος*? The answer seems to be simple. It is this: the Septuagint knew that ערף in this passage did not mean 'neck,' but 'a cervic vertebra' (probably the second vertebra). They knew that ערף had here a technical, an anatomical meaning. They knew that ערף here meant not *αὐχήν*, *νῶτον*, or *τράχηλος*, but *σφόνδυλος*. And therefore they used the word *σφόνδυλος*. ערף here, therefore, does not mean 'neck,' but 'a cervic vertebra.'

Now the meaning of ממול ערפו is perfectly clear. מול has its ordinary meaning 'front of.' ממול ערפו means 'in front of its cervic vertebra,' *i.e.* the flesh and skin in front of the vertebra. The flesh and skin in front of the vertebra form a part of the neck. The words ומלק את ראשו ממול ערפו ולא יבדיל would therefore have to be translated: 'and he shall pinch off its head in front of its cervic vertebra (or neck-bone), but shall not divide it asunder.' Which cervic vertebra was meant was well known. It was probably the second cervic vertebra. About cervic vertebræ of birds, see Richard Owen, *On the Anatomy of Vertebrates*, vol. ii. (1866), pp. 39–41 (§ 127, Cervical Vertebræ).

It is possible that ערף originally meant only 'a cervic vertebra,' 'a neck-bone,' and afterwards was used for 'neck' and 'back.' The later general use of ערף for 'neck' caused the meaning of 'vertebra,' 'neck-bone,' to be forgotten in the course of time. The Septuagint still knew the real meaning of ערף in Lv 5^8.

I venture to suggest that in the time of the *Sifra* and the *Mishna*, and probably also in the earlier period of the *Gemara*, the technical meaning of ערף in Lv 5^8 was still known. The *Sifra*, commenting on ממול ערפו, says מול הרואה את העורף, 'The front that sees the עורף.' Now if the Rabbis had meant here by עורף 'the neck,' 'the front that sees the neck' would give no sense. How can a part of the neck see the neck? But if the Rabbis took ערף to mean 'a cervic vertebra,' 'a neck-bone,' then the words of the *Sifra* are clear: 'The front that sees the (known) cervic vertebra.' All that part of the neck that sees the vertebra, that covers the vertebra, really faces the vertebra. מול הרואה את העורף is then an excellent definition of ממול ערפו.

I believe that in *Ḥullin* 19^b in the *Gemara*, following the *Mishna* (6½ lines), the knowledge of ערף='vertebra,' 'neck-bone,' is implied. When the *Gemara* says ערף ממש it means 'really ערף,' namely, 'vertebra.' It would lead me too far to show here how the whole passage in *Ḥullin* 19^b can be explained satisfactorily if we assume that this meaning was implied in the argument (I made this clear to my students during my lecture). I have no doubt that this tradition was still known then. Later it apparently was forgotten, and the scholars of post-Talmudic times and such great commentators as R. Gershom and Rashi did not know any more this tradition of ערף='vertebra.' Hence all the

difficulties in the later explanations of the two words ממול ערפו. But I venture to think that the explanation offered above removes the difficulties and makes the meaning of ערפו ממול perfectly clear.

SAMUEL DAICHES.

Jews' College, London.

'The Mote and the Beam' and 'The Gates of Hades.'

IN the November number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES (p. 91), Dean Webster attempts to revive Furrer's proposal that *eye* in Mt 7^{3-5} = Lk $6^{41.42}$ is a mistake for the household *well*. Furrer supported his emendation thus: 'In all Semitic languages the word *eye* at the same time signifies *well*, because its fundamental idea is that of glimmering surface.'

Although it is true that the Aramaic sounds עֵינָא are used to denote both *eye* and *well*, it is uncertain whether we are dealing with homonyms from two distinct roots, or with one word in both a literal and metaphorical use. But if they are identical the two uses are related, not through 'glimmering surface,' but through 'fount of water.' For עֵינָא means *well* in the sense of *spring*, not of *cistern*—German *Quelle*, not *Brunnen*. This distinction is fatal to Furrer's reconstruction of the origin of the saying.

Incidentally, however, Dr. Webster supports another emendation suggested by Dr. Bernard in his *Studia Sacra*. In an article on 'The Gates of Hades' (previously printed in the *Expositor*, June 1916—and cf. Peake's Commentary, *ad loc.*), he suggested that all would be clear in Mt 16^{18} if instead of *gates* we had some word meaning *waters* or *floods*. Rejecting the probability of a corruption between πηγαί and πύλαι, he adduced two Semitic words which (he claimed) had the required sense and might be misinterpreted to mean *gates* and so be mistranslated πύλαι.

In Dn 8^{2} occurs the phrase ואני הייתי עַל אוּבַל אוּלַי, 'and I was by the river Ulai' (E.VV.). The word translated *river* (אוּבַל) recurs only in Jer 17^{8} (as יוּבַל; and cf. יָבָל, Is 30^{25} 44^{4}). In Daniel apparently Symmachus alone of ancient Greek translators understood the word; the LXX confused it with the Aramaic אֲבוּלָא, (*city-*)*gate*; and Bernard supposed that the same misapprehension might underlie our present Gospel text. He was inclined to admit that it is hazardous to assume a common use of this rarely attested word in the imperfectly known Aramaic of the first century (the reverse confusion would at least have proved that it was familiar to the translator). But he overlooked a point of much greater importance—the real meaning of the word. It signifies not a natural stream of water (still less the *torrent* or *flood* which Bernard desiderated), but *conduit* or *canal*, a species of waterway of which the Ulai was a notable example. The Semitic root means *lead, bring*, and occurs frequently in Akkadian in connexion with the irrigation system. Bernard adduces abundant evidence of the ancient conceptions of the overwhelming floods of Hades; but where do we hear of its canals?

Alternatively, Bernard pointed out that in Is 28^{2} several MSS and editions mistakenly read עַשׁ, *gate*, for שַׁעַר, *storm*; and he suggested that the same 'trifling blunder of eyesight' led to the introduction of the word *gates* in Mt 16.

Apart from the improbability of its being a question of *eyesight* (the diacritical point is probably relatively late, and the blunder would therefore be one of *hearing* or *interpretation*), this remedy has two great weaknesses. First, we must not work with both a Hebrew and an Aramaic 'original' for the Gospels; with all their near kinship, these languages are distinct. Now Hebrew is a mixed language within which we can distinguish at least two layers—an older akin to Canaanite and Akkadian, and a younger in closer connexion with the later Semitic dialects including Aramaic. שַׁעַר, *storm*, belongs to the earlier, non-Aramiac stratum; it corresponds with the Assyrian *šânu*, and is elsewhere only found in New Hebrew. To assume its presence in Matthew would almost necessitate the supposition of a *Hebrew* original.

Secondly, although the 'root' is used of a storm at sea in Jonah 1^{11}, its meaning is a storm, not of waters, but of *wind*. It belongs to a group of words apparently formed from an original biliteral Dar or Sar which appears in more than a score of Hebrew 'roots,' always with the ground-meaning of *move round, surround, enclose*—e.g., אזר, *gird, encompass*; חצר, *surround*; דור, *circle, ball*, etc. (For 'internal triliteralization' with ע, cf. רעץ with רשׁשׁ, רצץ, רצה, etc., all = *shatter, crush*, from the biliteral Ras; and (?) סעף, *split, divide*, with חשׁב, *think*, from Shab, *split, discern*, etc.; and notice סחר, *go round about*, כַּחְרָה, Ps 91^{4}, *buckler*, and תַּחְרָא, *corselet*.) The meaning of שׁער is thus *a whirling storm*, or *cyclone—turbo* (Akkadian *šâru* means *wind*). To connect such a word with the *floods* of the underworld is highly precarious.

The hypothesis of an Aramaic original is a valuable adjunct to the exegesis of the Gospels;

but it is a dangerous weapon in the hands of those who have won their renown in other fields of scholarship.

P. L. Hedley.

Great Meols, Cheshire.

The Decree of Acts xv.

The Decree of Acts ($15^{20.\ 29}$ 21^{25}) is puzzling, as every one knows. Here appears to be a strange mingling of the ethical, and the legal or ceremonial; of principle and temporary expedient. Prohibitions regarding food—blood and things strangled—are strangely bracketed with fundamental sins like idolatry and fornication.

1. Since the Western Text omits 'and from things strangled,' we may be justified in interpreting 'blood' to mean *bloodshed*, and so making the Decree wholly ethical; forbidding murder, idolatry, and fornication.

2. On the contrary, consistency may be obtained by finding in the Decree laws of observance only. Supposing, as Dr. Rendel Harris suggests (*Sidelights on N.T. Research*; cf. *Bentleii Critica Sacra*, Ellis), a scribe has, in copying, put down ΠΟΡΝΕΙΑΣ where he should have written ΧΟΙΡΕΙΑΣ. Then 'fornication' is an error for 'swine's flesh.' Thus the Decree would originally refer to pollutions of idols, swine's flesh, things strangled, and blood. All is plain and simple; here is a Ritual Decree.

3. But the Decree may not be so simple; it may contain just that element which is so historically interesting. As it stands, there are the two ethical commands and the two ritual commands. But the two ritual commands are really one, or governed by one consideration; and that consideration is truly spiritual, to them. To eat blood, either as such or in things strangled, was not to the Jewish Christian a breach of ritual law. It was the mark of the beast. It was cardinally pagan. To them all, probably not least to Paul himself, there was an abiding horror in the thought. As truly as idolatry or fornication, it led back to darkness. It was impossible to expect any converted Jew to live in Christian amity with fellow-worshippers who engaged in so religiously shocking and indecent a practice.

In short, texts and scribes do not open a way of understanding here. What is required is an historical appreciation of the singular significance, for the life of religion itself, of the blood.

Only the other day I met with interesting confirmation of this conclusion. In Christian communities drawn from heathenism, as in West Africa, the native Christian courts (*e.g.* the kirk-session) while dealing severely with coarser sins, yet reserve their sternest censure for reversion to idolatrous practices. Taking the oath in a law-court by drinking the ordeal water, instead of swearing on the Bible, or fulfilling the old custom of presenting the chief with game taken in hunting that he may offer part of it in sacrifice, or at weddings or funerals accepting ancient heathen custom—all these are the most heinous sins. My informant emphasizes the extreme freshness and appositeness of the New Testament injunctions to the life of to-day. To the African these are not ritual questions; they go to the very root of faith.

Innes Logan.

Ayr.

St. Paul's 'Infirmity.'

We shall probably never know with certainty what St. Paul's infirmity was. Tradition has it that it was severe headache, and Dr. David Smith argues very plausibly that it was malaria, nothing more. But there is an illness, more elusive than malaria, without a definite name of its own to this day, which corresponds to St. Paul's illness in all its details. This 'Migraine,' as it is usually called, is peculiar to no one age, sex, nation, or climate, but persons of an ardent and impulsive nature are most liable to it. Migraine, in its severe form, prostrates the sufferer completely without any warning, save that of sudden paralysis of the optic nerve. We know that St. Paul's sight was affected during his attacks. He reminds the Galatians of their kindness, and says, 'You would have plucked out your own eyes and given them to me.' Migraine attacks the eyes first of all before any head pain is felt, malaria does not. In a case I know the following is the course of the illness. The day before the attack the sufferer is often particularly active in mind, full of plans and ideas, and feeling eager and fit to carry them out. Paul was in this condition on the journey to Damascus, 'breathing out threatenings and slaughter.' Quite suddenly the next day a slanting shaft of light, a sudden movement of something just outside direct vision, a sharp noise, or some shock or surprise, pleasant or unpleasant, abruptly causes semi-blindness; nothing can be seen from the side of the eyes save a blank wall; he is physically hoodwinked. In Paul's case the sudden flash of lightning blinded him entirely. Complete prostration and severe headache follow, the patient is totally disabled, as far as action and conversation are concerned, though his

mind is often acutely active. Paul lay without sight three days, and neither ate nor drank; but his mind was wide awake, for he prayed and had the vision of Ananias coming to him.

Doctors call this migraine a constitutional malady, and there is no escape from it. Drugs do not benefit, though I have been told that 'it will ease with age.' It is by no means of regular occurrence, though it often follows a period of mental strain; its very irregularity and uncertainty plus its power to put its victim instantly *hors de combat* would make it, much more even than malaria, a source of trouble to the Apostle. It runs its course in a few days, but its visitation is always so sudden, often in the middle of work or conversation, and so overwhelming that the sufferer is helpless before it; it is as St. Paul, finding no technical name, terms it, 'a messenger of Satan come to buffet,' 'a thorn in the flesh,' though not in the mind.

ELEANOR ANGLIN JOHNSON.

Guiseley, near Leeds.

The Nestle Greek New Testament.

IN December 1927, the Bible Society, Stuttgart, Germany, issued from its press a few copies of the new Nestle Greek New Testament, which is the most objective edition, suitable both for the scholar and the student.

The great editions of Tischendorf, von Soden, Weiss, and Westcott-Hort are excellent as far as they go, but we must admit that they are subjective in their treatment of the text. Tischendorf stresses the Sinaiticus ('ℵ'), Weiss and Westcott-Hort fall back upon the Vaticanus ('B'); the one because it was his own discovery, the other because of its neutrality. All three gave their own recensions. It is very difficult to avoid subjectiveness, especially when an editor falls back upon a single manuscript as a basic text. This Dr. Eberhard Nestle endeavoured, in all of his editions, to avoid.

In 1913, Dr. Erwin Nestle, son of the late Dr. Eberhard Nestle, was called upon by the Bible Society to carry forward the work begun by his father. The 'Great War' and post-war conditions prevented much work, so that only a few corrections had been made. Before undertaking the 13th edition, Dr. Nestle presented to the Congress of New Testament Scholars, which met at Magdeburg, 1924, a number of propositions for its approval. The Congress accepted the propositions, and they have been fully adopted in this 13th edition.

The scholarship of to-day demands an objective edition. It is not concerned so much about what editors have to say as about what bearing the old testimonies have upon the text. It wants an edition based on no single text, the text to be an eclectic or resultant. The Nestle Greek N.T. proposes as far as possible to meet this demand. The Nestle text is a resultant of the editors' text mentioned above, but its critical apparatus takes account of the older testimonies, codices (especially 'D' and the 'Western text'), papyri, versions, and Church Fathers. These testimonies have not been given too briefly, but briefly enough, so that the scholar and the student may get a survey of the history of the text, and the peculiarities of its old recensions. Even the latest papyri ('A papyrus fragment of Matthew 26^{19-52}—Michigan 1570' and the 'Papyrus fragment of the Acts 18^{22}–19^{6} 19^{12-16}—Michigan 1571' both of the III sæc. Published by Dr. Henry Sanders, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor) have received some consideration. This is but one instance of its up-to-dateness.

The governing principle of the basic text is that which was laid down by the late Dr. Eberhard Nestle, 'That the majority of the editions of Tischendorf, Weiss and Westcott-Hort determine the text.' This governing principle has made the edition quite objective. In the critical apparatus, there is a well-selected and carefully classified list of testimonies, manuscripts, versions, and Church Fathers. Added to these testimonies are the editorial references of Tischendorf, Weiss, and Westcott-Hort, and, in the new edition, those of von Soden. These editorial references are given after the testimonies, thus giving the views of these editors in reference to the readings, so that the student may be able to see at a glance what is most trustworthy. The reference to von Soden is only used where the variation is not supported by the other three editors. The apparatus is the most workable, not only for the scholar but also for the student. In the preparation of the apparatus, Dr. Erwin Nestle kept in view not only the private study, but also the university lecture and the theological seminary classroom.

The Greek orthography has been changed from that of the Egyptian writers of the fourth and fifth centuries to that according to the philological principles of the time of the origin of the books of the New Testament. The quotation and stichical arrangements have been printed in heavier type. These have been corrected independently of Tischendorf, Weiss, and Westcott-Hort. Signs have been placed in the body of the text, directing

the reader to a similar sign in the apparatus. They are useful and save considerable time.

There is another distinctive feature to which I desire to call attention—the marginal references. These have been rearranged, enlarged, and placed as closely as possible to the line to which they belong. There is a sign (!), meaning that there are more references given. This system of marginal references serves as an excellent concordance. In the inner margin one finds such text-divisions as are given in all the New Testament codices, especially Codex Vaticanus, as well as the canons of Eusebius. These are useful, serving both as a synopsis and as a harmony of the Gospels. There is a preface in English as well as in German and Latin. In the preface the beginner will find directions as to the use of the apparatus.

The new Nestle is not intended to replace Tischendorf, Weiss, or Westcott-Hort editions, but to become a workable tool in the hands of the university professor and student, for the busy clergyman as well as for the scholar. It bids fair to become the most important edition both for the classroom and the private study.

H. W. C. Ainley.

Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Entre Nous.

Christ in Shakespeare.

After his evening service in Wellington Church, Glasgow, Dr. G. H. Morrison has been giving a series of addresses on the moral and spiritual elements in the tragedies of Shakespeare—*Christ in Shakespeare* (James Clarke; 3s. 6d. net). There is nothing new in Dr. Morrison's interpretation of Shakespeare—indeed, he himself disclaims any originality here. But in what he sets out to do he has succeeded most admirably. It is to show from the plays of Shakespeare that there is a moral and spiritual order in the world. Shakespeare, as Dr. Morrison says, has the thoroughly scientific temper in his perfect fidelity to fact. If we can see, then, in the tragedies of Shakespeare that consequences cannot be escaped from and that God is not indifferent to moral issues, then this must pull us up short as no prejudiced witness could do. Shakespeare leaves us with the glowing certainty that the good are the real victors, though they perish, and that heaven, though dark with clouds, is on their side. If we take as an example of Dr. Morrison's lectures the one on temptation, we see how freshly and persuasively he uses the tragedy of Macbeth to bring home his points.

Dr. Morrison notes first that in Macbeth there was solicitation from without. The play begins with the witches. 'One feels the sublimity of Shakespeare's genius in this that he so paints the witches in foul and dusky awfulness, that though belief in witches has disappeared, nobody feels like laughing at them yet.' The predictions of the witches were solicitations, for the statements they made about the future gives to the mind of Macbeth a bent and bias. Dr. Morrison asks what Shakespeare meant by this kind of solicitation from without.

'There is no moral evil in the scheme of things. The only possible external pressure is that exercised by personalities.

'It is not fashionable to believe in the devil now; and in view of popular conceptions of the devil that is scarcely to be wondered at. But that there is some mighty and malign intelligence, who organizes and controls the powers of darkness; that we wrestle not with flesh and blood, but with principalities and powers, this, the belief of Jesus, seems to me entirely philosophic, and alone adequate to account for many of the phenomena of human life and history.'

Besides the witches, there is another external influence dominating Macbeth. It was the solicitation of his wife. Macbeth not only admires her, he loves her most devotedly and tenderly. Macbeth is tempted, then, by his dearest. So was Jesus tempted by Simon Peter, and so has many a man been tempted. 'It has been said that when the devil wants to snare an Englishman he generally does it through his wife and children.'

But the play shows that solicitation is powerless unless it finds an answering cord. If there was none, why did Macbeth start when he heard the witches' prophecies? Banquo heard them unmoved.

It was Macbeth's undecided will that gave the powers of hell their opportunity. When Lady Macbeth insisted upon the murder, he says—and this is a touch of significance—'We will speak further.'

It was in the days of his success too that temptation met Macbeth. He was the saviour of his country, flushed with a double victory. 'Success is always apt to dim the grandeur of the moral law. A man in the hour of magnificent success is prone to think he is above morality. Restrictions are meant for common people; conquering

genius is above restriction; no one has the right to legislate for it.'

'The hour of triumph is just as hard to bear as the hour of humiliation and defeat. Success, no less than failure, has its doors that open on to hell. Had Macbeth been beaten by Macdonwald the witches would never have appeared to him.'

And then Dr. Morrison notes that temptation met Macbeth along the line of his dominating ambition.

'With Othello it was different. He was tempted in unexpected ways. Jealousy seemed alien from Othello. Tempted there, he was taken by surprise. But Macbeth was not taken by surprise, nor assailed from an unlikely quarter. He was struck at through the passion of his soul.

'So was it with our blessed Lord, when He was tempted with the vision of the kingdoms. Satan knew that the passion of His soul was to be Master of the kingdoms of the world. But He, in perfect poise with God, imperiously rejected the short-cut, and took the long and lonely way to final sovereignty.

'Short-cuts are not God's. Neither Israel nor Christ was led that way. One of the subtlest temptations of the human soul is to outstrip God in its ambitions. Along that avenue Macbeth was tempted, and, being tempted, fell; and we say with Othello, "Oh, the pity of it."'

Luke 2[38].

'"She . . . gave thanks to God, and spoke about the child to all who were living in expectation of the liberation of Jerusalem."—Luke 2[38] (GOODSPEED).

'A fine way to live—in expectation of liberation!

'There existed a definite class of people in the Israel of Jesus' day consisting of sentinel souls who lived in the expectation that something was going to happen. And the very expectation that God would do something helped immeasurably to make it happen. For that group of people were the seed-plot in which Jesus' message first took root. They received Him because they were looking for Him.

'It is such sentinel souls who make possible the liberation of mankind from the grip of ancient wrong. Nothing really great ever happened without a great many lives being lived "in expectation." Arthur J. Gossip says finely:

'"They are the kind of folks by whom the world moves forward: who live in a *qui vive* of expectancy, always standing on tiptoe, always sure that something big may happen at any time. Hush! Is not this it coming now? With people like that God can do anything. But you and I keep thwarting Him by sheer dullness of spirit. We are listless, apathetic, blasé, bored; our hopes are small and thin. There is no audacity in our expectation."

'Lorne Pierce traces the same truth back to the Old Testament:

'"A. B. Davidson once called the Prophets 'always terribly one-sided people.' That single idea was that 'God is going to do something.' 'God is surely coming!' cries Isaiah. 'He is here, at our very door!' answers Zephaniah. And so each and every one by their faith made it possible, yea, certain, for some great spiritual surprise to take place. It is upon this that the rest is builded: 'And when the time was fulfilled—Jesus came.' Did it ever happen otherwise? Truth is an emperor that only comes to visit his subjects along the highway of great longing. Science advances to its kingdom along the avenues of expectancy. Religion comes into its own along the road of loving hearts, that great-hearted clan of intrepid believers."

'But not all of Christ's followers feel this quickened pulse beat of expectant faith.

'Some are asleep.

'Some are satisfied. Their eyes never wistfully scan the horizon. Their hearts are never hungry.

'Some are looking, but they are looking back.

'The golden age for them is in the past. For some reason yesterday belonged to God but not to-morrow. They say good-bye to sunsets but never welcome a dawn.

'There is an even deeper meaning in the words "living in expectation" than appears on the surface. It is this: only as we live in expectation do we truly live at all.

'Are our spirits on tiptoe or stretched on a couch? There is one easy way to learn the answer. What is our habitual attitude to the world's "impossibles," to the great dreams of men—the abolition of war, the coming of brotherhood, the curbing of greed, the exploitation of the unprivileged? Do we live, and work, in eager expectation of these things?'

This is one of the hundred and fifty texts commented on by Mr. Halford E. Luccock in *Preaching Values* (Abingdon Press; $2.00). The purpose of the volume is to show the value of the modern translation to the preacher. The translations chosen are those of Weymouth, Goodspeed, and Moffatt, and the texts chosen are those which add a new idea or give some fresh insight not so readily got from the more familiar language of the A.V. or R.V.

The Faith of Chauncey M. Depew.

Since his death in the spring of this year there have been long accounts in the American papers of Mr. Chauncey M. Depew, America's 'Grand Old Man,' whose prescription for longevity was: 'Work, temperance, and fun.' *The Methodist Recorder* gives an interesting extract from a paper which he wrote last year. 'From my experience of ninety-three years,' he wrote, 'I am more firmly anchored to the Bible than ever before, and believe implicitly in its teachings and in the God it portrays. I have always felt a real dependency on God. My idea of God is personal; not a personality such as we are, of course, but a glorified divine and infinite heart, brain and spirit, all-comprehending, all-powerful, never-failing. I think of God as being interested in mortals and mortal affairs, Christ as His earthly manifestation; Christ, who understood, lived, toiled, and suffered upon earth as men and women do; Christ, who died, as we must do before we live again. Christ, God's pledge of love. I don't believe much in chance; you have to make things come your way, and they will come your way if you will follow the rules of moderation, of not worrying, of diversifying your interest, of trusting God, and loving your fellow-beings. A thing I have never lost is faith in the efficacy of prayer. I have tested it repeatedly. It has never failed.'

NEW POETRY.

Gilbert Thomas.

The poems of Mr. Gilbert Thomas are marked by a quiet felicity. A new volume of lyrics has just been published by Messrs. Allen & Unwin. The title is taken from the first poem, *Mary of Huntingdon* (3s. 6d.) About half of the poems are religious, and of these the most considerable is Bartimæus. The blind Bartimæus was the King of Mendicants, and every day he was brought to his site—'there was in all the world no better site'—by his snugly parasitic friends. Here is how the poem ends:

Then, wakening from his tomb
Of darkness, Bartimæus praised His name;
And all the people glorified Him too.
And, hearing the universal acclamation,
The friends of Bartimæus also swelled
The chorus. And they followed Him a mile
Beyond the city.
But when darkness fell,
And all his friends and relatives sought his home
And cursed him for a fool, then in the soul
Of Bartimæus himself there sprang a fear.
He had broken the old smooth life. Never again
Would he be led to the familiar pitch
Beside the gateway, and his gnarled old hands
No longer now would clutch at easy wealth.
A night of hardship and of poverty
Already darkened his new sky. His friends
Had called him 'fool.' Was he in very deed
A fool? . . .
And then the bright moon answered him.
He had not seen the moon since, as a boy
He shepherded his flock upon the plain.
Now, from behind a cloud, majestically
It sailed into the fairway of the heavens . . .
And all the heart of Bartimæus sang.

S. P. T. Prideaux.

The Rev. S. P. T. Prideaux, D.D., has published with the S.P.C.K. (6d.) a charming little booklet containing selections from *The Odes of Solomon* rendered into English verse. These Odes are believed to have been sung at the Baptism of Catechumens in the Early Church, and the translator hopes that his renderings may serve to-day as hymns at Confirmations and Adult Baptisms. In this hope he ought not to be disappointed, for the translations are admirably done. They have the merit which few translations can claim of being at once idiomatic and musical. Here is a specimen verse from a hymn entitled Peace:

Ah! more than shelter He,
More than foundation-stone;
His dew was as a mother's milk,
His arms a mother's own.

Here is another from 'The Rapt Soul':

Rich as is the sweetness
Of the honey-bee,
Full as is a mother's love,
So I hope in Thee.

The selections, which are in various metres, are all furnished with appropriate titles, and suggestions are offered regarding the hymn-tunes to which they should be sung. This is a book of real religious poetry.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

It has been left to Dr. Edgar J. Goodspeed, of the Chair of Biblical and Patristic Greek in the University of Chicago, to present and largely to substantiate the position that Christian literature may be said to have developed not so much by individual documents as by collections. This he does in a recent work, *New Solutions of New Testament Problems* (Cambridge University Press; 10s. net), a work marked by clear and popular exposition, but with a tendency in places to needless repetition.

It has not escaped the notice of students of the New Testament that up to the publication of the Acts no work of Christian literature shows acquaintance with Paul's letters, whereas after the appearance of the Acts practically every Christian document does so. What is the meaning of it? It shows, says Dr. Goodspeed, that the publication of the Acts, in which Paul plays so impressive a part, led to the collection and publication of the Pauline letters. How else are we to explain on the one hand the ignorance in the Acts of Paul's letters, and on the other hand the knowledge of them in practically every later Christian document?

The collection of Paul's letters provides the clue, for example, to the problem of the letter to the Ephesians. It is not a letter to Ephesus, but a general or encyclical letter, as our most ancient manuscripts appear to show; it is apparently not by Paul, yet it contains much that is from Paul, and it had a place in the first Pauline collection. What is the explanation of these facts (granted that they are facts)? It is that Ephesians is an editorial addition to the Pauline *corpus*, having been written in Paul's name for the purpose of introducing and commending the individual letters to the churches to which they had not been originally addressed.

We do not find any particular psychological difficulty in this theory as to the origin and nature of Ephesians, and are ready to grant that the writing of Ephesians in the name of Paul is analogous to the composition of the Pauline speeches in the Acts. But we would notice, incidentally, an apparent inconsistency in Dr. Goodspeed's exposition. He cannot have it both ways. It looks as if he must either withdraw the suggestion (p. 19) that a model for Ephesians was supplied to the editor of the first Pauline collection by the general covering letter in the Revelation (1^{4-20}) which prefaces the letters to the seven churches, or else withdraw the statement (p. 23) that the model before the mind of the writer of the Revelation can only have been the Pauline collection (including Ephesians).

It is also claimed that the collection of Pauline letters following upon the publication of the Acts furnishes the clue to the next phase of early Christian literature—the epistolary. Until the letters of Paul were assembled and published the Church possessed only gospels and historical writ-

ings, Mark, Matthew, Luke, and Acts. The appearance of the Pauline collection made for a revival of the letter form and was the signal for a shower of Christian 'letters' to churches: the Revelation, Hebrews, 1 Peter, 1 Clement, 1 John, 2 John, 3 John, Ignatius, etc. etc.

The principal exception to the epistolary style in this period is the Gospel of John, which none the less shows the influence of the Pauline collection. And just as the Pauline collection gave a new impulse and direction to the early Christian literature, so it was also with the collection of the Four Gospels. This latter collection led to the publication of almost a score of later Gospels, such as the Gospels of Peter, James, and Thomas.

Whatever criticisms of Dr. GOODSPEED'S 'new solutions' may be offered in detail, we think that his general position is well worthy of consideration, namely, that Christian literature developed by collections rather than by individual documents, and that it may serve to throw fresh light upon New Testament problems. It is certainly an interesting and plausible suggestion that he makes in his pages regarding the presence of Philemon in the Pauline *corpus*.

It is always a healthful experience to see ourselves as others see us, for self-criticism is notoriously difficult. We of the white race have been accustomed to regard our ways as in every respect superior to those of other races, and we have offered them, all too condescendingly, our religion and our civilization as unmingled blessings. How has it affected them, and what are they thinking about it all?

These are questions to which the Student Christian Movement has sought to find an answer. From five groups of nationals, weighty expressions of opinion have been secured on the impact of Christian civilization, its influence on native thought and life. Each group consists of about ten writers, all carefully chosen as men of culture and experience, able to voice with authority the opinion of their various races and countries. The result is published in five small volumes, edited by Milton Stauffer (3s. net), under the titles *Japan speaks for Herself*, *China her own Interpreter*, *An Indian Approach to India*, *Voices from the Near East*, and *Thinking with Africa*. We are bound to acknowledge cordially the general competence and fairness of the writers. Their lofty tone, singularly free from bitterness, is well fitted to carry conviction.

What is their verdict? It may be given in a single sentence. They find much to criticise in our Western civilization, a good deal also to criticise in our churches and missionaries, but Christ they find to be above criticism.

Their criticisms of Western civilization are severe. They find it a mingled stream, with much mud and filth polluting its waters. Japan says, 'With Christ came anti-Christ, with the missionaries came anti-missionaries, with the Holy Scriptures came the bottle of whiskey.' Africa complains bitterly of land-grabbing and exploiting. There is no square deal for the black man. The native agitator says, 'The missionary told you to close your eyes and pray, and the other whites came and took away the land from behind your back. . . . At first we had the land and the white man had the Bible; now we have the Bible and the white man has the land.' The racial pride of the white man is universally declared to be intolerable. These nationals would echo to a man the cry of the Psalmist, 'Have mercy upon us, O Lord, have mercy upon us; for we are exceedingly filled with contempt. Our soul is exceedingly filled with the scorning of those that are at ease, and with the contempt of the proud.' Many of our social customs they regard as shameless. They speak of 'the shame it brings to Eastern eyes to see naked arms and necks, promiscuous dancing, attendance at questionable theatres and cinemas.' It is this which has made many of the best minds in the East view with horror the prospect of their women becoming westernized. 'Observe the conditions in western countries. Where is morality? Where is dignity and modesty? . . .

What we fear and what we flee from is her adoption of customs which call attention to herself, of the habit of painting her face and of wearing such absurd clothes that persons of a sound and pure character cannot but revolt against it.' Western civilization is in many respects a millstone about the neck of the gospel. 'Most natives have rejected the Christian life because of the white men who are non-communicants, non-service-attenders, non-prayer-sayers.' The missionary is compelled to combat strenuously the notion that Christianity is the white man's religion.

The criticism of the churches and the missionaries, if less severe, is weighty. The divisions of the churches and the intolerance of sects are everywhere deplored. 'There is hardly any greater hindrance to the spread of Christianity than the present diversity of denominations.' 'Why should we repeat in China this chapter of darkness found in the history, both ancient and current, of the Christian movements of the West? May we be spared these unchristian experiences.' The imperfect lives of Christians are another stumbling-block. 'The professors of Christianity have dismally failed to live up to the standard commanded them by their Master.' The missionaries themselves are not free from racial pride and a tendency to domineer. An interesting distinction is noted in various quarters to the effect that the older missionaries were more earnest and self-sacrificing, while the younger are more appreciative of native culture and religious thought. When all is said, however, by way of criticism, the verdict is practically unanimous that the Christian missionary is still needed. The native churches are too young and inexperienced to stand alone. The alien forces of Western materialism are felt to be too overpowering, and Christian help is earnestly sought. 'Should not the Christians of Europe and America send their finest men and women to point out to us different and better ways?'

Of Christ Himself and the spirit of His gospel there is not a breath of criticism. He is accepted as the supreme standard of judgment, and men everywhere are stretching out their hands to Him. 'Spiritually this country (Syria), like all the countries of the Near East, is thirsty for the plain and simple truth. The people are yearning to see the light.' Specially eloquent is the appeal of China. 'With all the opposition to, criticism of, and attack upon the Christian religion, our Chinese people, to borrow the phrase of an outstanding anti-Christian leader, are consciously or unconsciously longing for someone to deliver them from "the dark and chilly pit into which China has fallen." China needs Christ. China needs a Christ who is simple and not hopelessly entangled in creeds and dogmas; China needs a Christ who is natural and not foreign; China needs a Christ who is united and not divided; China needs a Christ who is constructive and not destructive; China needs a Christ who will save and will be her friend unto the end. . . . Christian missionaries and Chinese church workers who can introduce men and women to the real Jesus are needed in China now more than ever before. Our people are rubbing their eyes, they are standing on tiptoe, and with outstretched hands are crying, "We want to see Jesus."'

There is no novelty in the assertion that our idea of God has been changing. Perhaps that is putting the matter too strongly. It ought rather to be said that our emphasis has been changing. The traditional idea of God has emphasized His transcendence. That idea is behind all the great systems. It is behind Calvinism and Lutheranism alike, behind the religious traditions of England, America, of Scotland and Germany. God lives above. He intervenes from without, and occasionally. He is outside His world. He needs to come into it. Miracle is one of these interventions. So is the Incarnation. So is Regeneration.

But to-day we are learning to think more of the Immanence of God, or rather of God as immanent in His world. Both science and philosophy have had something to do with this, but especially science. Perhaps no single stream of influence has been so formative in this matter as the theory of evolution. It is perhaps in the attempt to interpret

evolution in a religious fashion more than in any other way that thinking people have come to dwell more on God *in* the universe than on God above it.

Canon Gamble of Bristol has devoted three lectures to this rediscovery of God and has published them under the title *The Traditional Idea of God* (Arrowsmith, Bristol; 1s. net). They are excellent lectures, and are specially helpful in suggesting several lines on which the idea of an indwelling God will be found useful in our religious thinking. These are not by any means exhaustive, but they point the way. On one point we might differ from the Canon—that the dominant idea of God in Scripture is that of transcendence. Surely the psalms are full of an indwelling God. And Paul's 'In him we live and move and have our being' is not singular in Paul. And what of the teaching of our Lord in which God is so near us that He counts the hairs of our head. It is not immanence as we are conceiving it. But it is in essence the same idea.

There are in particular three ways in which this thought of immanence has changed our religious thinking and helped us to better thoughts. To one of these Canon Gamble draws attention in a suggestive passage. It is the transformation in what used to be called an argument from design. Paley saw God in the world because the world was like a watch and demanded a maker. God was an Artificer. To-day we do not look at it like that. We look out on the universe and see one fact everywhere, that of order. And we see it as an expression of a Mind that is moulding the world and life from within. Evolution is one aspect of this order. The stages of life are the result of a Divine force working from within. And so comes a doctrine like emergent evolution. The different steps up in evolution are as it were the successive expressions of an immanent life and power. God is not so much a Creator as a Moulder of the universe.

Another result has been the widening of our thoughts about the world of men. God has not revealed Himself only in one nation. All great teachers have revealed Him. God has expressed Himself in all the leaders of all the nations. We used to think of other religions as false. Now we can see in them part of God's self-expression. Buddha, Confucius, Socrates, and Browning and Carlyle—these also are the outgoing of the Divine presence. We are even compelled to go further, and say that as God dwells in all, so all truth and all goodness are part of His ways. There is no necessary discrepancy between this wider view and the belief in a special revelation. The indwelling God reveals Himself everywhere and in all truth and in all good, but for special ends has revealed Himself fully in one people and one Life.

Finally, this rediscovery of God makes two of the Christian affirmations easier of belief, the Incarnation and Miracle. If God is in a sense incarnate in all good men, then the long line of leaders and saints have in a way prepared for Christ. But in Christ the Divine Life has at last fully manifested Himself. This makes history rational and Christianity credible. It places the unique Incarnation of God in Christ in a thought-setting which enables the modern mind to accept it. The same is true of miracle. Miracle is not the intervention of a God from without to remedy some trouble. It is the plus of the Divine activity within the world. It is the indwelling God expressing Himself with emphasis. It is the something more of God's activity.

In these ways, at any rate, this ancient and now modern idea of God is going to remodel or remould our religious thinking. But, it may be asked, is there not an equal truth in God's transcendence? Well, we can, any of us, only say one thing at a time.

The Gospel according to the Hebrews.

By the Reverend R. Dunkerley, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Gloucester.

I.

'Only the very daring, nowadays, venture on speculations in regard to the Gospel according to the Hebrews,' Streeter remarks.[1] The subject is too important, however, for us to be content to leave it in its present unsatisfactory state. A very interesting group of sayings ascribed to Jesus in Patristic literature are quoted as from such a Gospel, and the questions whence these derive and whether any of them may be thought authentic are most fascinating and perplexing conundrums.

I.

We have, first of all, to consider whether there was more than one such Gospel in use amongst Hebrew Christians, and if so, how many there were and their relationship to each other. These are vexed questions. The difficulties arise from the conflicting statements of various early writers, and from the known unreliability of some upon whose evidence we depend. The facts will be found in full in Dr. Moffatt's article, 'Gospels (Uncanonical)' in the *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*. All that need be given here is a summary, first, of the ancient evidence (without detailed references), then, of the modern controversy upon it, leading up to a statement of my own conclusions on the matter.

The salient facts are as follows :

(1) Hegesippus is (on the authority of Eusebius) the first writer known to have used one or more such Gospels. He is stated to have included in his memoirs extracts from the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Syriac.' As there is some doubt as to the exact meaning of the words of Eusebius, and as we shall have occasion to refer to them again, I will give them here : *ἐκ τε τοῦ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγελίου καὶ τοῦ Συριακοῦ καὶ ἰδίως ἐκ τῆς Ἑβραίδος διαλέκτου τινὰ τίθησιν.*

(2) Clement (Alex.) and Origen both quoted occasionally but not often from a 'Gospel according to the Hebrews,' and evidently regarded it as worth using though not on a level with the Four. The most important passage in Origen, however, that of the 'other rich man' (which will be studied later), is only extant in a Latin translation of one of his commentaries ; its absence from the Greek is suspicious. Jerome states that Origen frequently used this Gospel, but the evidence is rather against that—though, of course, many of his works have not survived. Further, it should be noticed that Origen speaks of a 'Gospel of the Twelve,' which he deemed heretical.

(3) Eusebius (in addition to the above reference to Hegesippus) refers to and quotes occasionally from a Gospel which he describes both as 'in the Hebrew tongue' and 'according to the Hebrews.' He places it amongst the Antilegomena, or books recognized by many but disputed by some, and says that it was the special delight of Hebrew Christians, but that the Ebionites who repudiated Paul used it alone. His reference to Papias regarding the story of the sinful woman does not make it certain that the latter knew this Gospel.

(4) Epiphanius speaks of the sect of the Nazarenes (by which term he appears to denote those Hebrew Christians just referred to) as using 'a very full Matthew in Hebrew,' which he had not examined. He describes more fully a Gospel used by the ascetic Ebionites, and says that it was 'the Gospel according to Matthew, not entire and perfectly complete, but falsified and mutilated, which they call the Hebrew,' and again 'according to the Hebrews.' He also says that Tatian's *Diatessaron* was called by some 'the Hebrew Gospel.'

(5) Jerome has many more references and gives many more extracts than these other writers. He says that he was allowed to copy the Gospels used by the Nazarenes of Berœa in Syria, that he translated it from Chaldaic-Syriac (in Hebrew letters) into Greek and Latin, that the Nazarenes generally and the Ebionites used it, that it was regarded by many as the original of Matthew, and that it was also called 'according to the Apostles.' He identifies it with the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews' used by Origen.

(6) Several Gospel MSS. have marginal notes to Matthew from *τὸ Ἰουδαικόν*, one of which agrees with matter cited by Jerome from the Hebrew Gospel.

(7) An odd fact is that in the Stichometry of Nicephorus the 'Gospel according to the Hebrews' is mentioned as having 2200 lines—300 fewer than

[1] *The Four Gospels*, p. 282.

canonical Matthew, of which it can therefore hardly have been a 'very full' edition.

On the basis of these facts it has been usual to distinguish two Gospels—that 'according to the Hebrews' known to Clement, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, and in common use amongst the Nazarenes or orthodox Jewish Christians, and that 'of the Ebionites,' also called 'of the Twelve' and 'of the Apostles,' referred to as heretical by Origen and quoted by Epiphanius. Jerome has been thought in error in suggesting that the Ebionites used the Hebrew Gospel known to him, unless he meant by Ebionites the orthodox Jewish Christians, in which case the difference between them and the Nazarenes is not clear; he has further been considered mistaken in stating that the book known to him was also the 'Gospel according to the Apostles,' which term has been thought—on the evidence of Origen—to belong rather to the Ebionite Gospel. The fact that each of these two books was in Aramaic would sufficiently explain the use of the phrases 'the Hebrew Gospel' and 'the Gospel according to the Hebrews' of each of them. We may express this result in Moffatt's notation, thus: NG=HG, and EG=TG. A variant of this was suggested by Nicholson who thought that EG was an heretical edition of HG, which would of course help to account for the confusion in names.[1]

Recent criticism has, however, raised objection to either of these readings of the facts. Vernon Bartlet seems to have been the first to suggest that we ought to distinguish two Hebrew Gospels—one used by Clement and the stricter Jews of Alexandria, and the other by Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, and Palestinian Christians.[2] His chief reason for this theory was that Clement knew no Aramaic, and yet quotes the Gospel as though it were well known to himself and his readers, while Jerome nearly two hundred years later says he translated it and evidently knew of no previous Greek version. Bartlet identified the work known to Clement with the 'Gospel according to the Twelve,' mentioned by Origen, and regarded the Ebionite Gospel as quite distinct. On this view, we have three separate works: HG (TG), NG, EG. This theory was hotly contested by Evelyn White,[3] who wrote, however, without knowledge of the completer investigation of the question by Schmidtke[4] and Waitz.[5] Their arguments have convinced both Findlay[6] and Moffatt[7] that HG and NG should be distinguished, Origen's NG being the same as Clement's, however, in opposition to Bartlet.

Findlay's valuable summary and discussion of Schmidtke's argument in *Byways in Early Christian Literature* should be specially noticed. He thinks the latter goes too far in discrediting Jerome's testimony as utterly unreliable, but that the following considerations carry great weight:

(1) Hegesippus' use of two Gospels [see above].
(2) The fact that a saying found in Ignatius is quoted by Jerome as from NG and by Origen from the 'Teaching of Peter,' while Eusebius says he does not know where it comes from.
(3) Origen might have been expected to refer to the deviations of the Nazarene Gospel from the canonical versions had these been known to him, but the only case in which he apparently does so is not certainly from his pen [see the fifth passage below].
(4) Eusebius' statement that 'Hebrews' was used by Ebionites who repudiated Paul is inconsistent with the fact that the community which used the Nazarene Gospel appears to have honoured Paul.
(5) Theodore of Mopsuestia's criticism of the Nazarene Gospel as a fifth Gospel fabricated by Jerome suggests that it was not the work quoted by Clement and Origen.

An inconsistency of Findlay's may just be noticed—he speaks of HG as the Gospel used by Clement, Origen, and Eusebius, yet in studying it he excludes the passages concerning the rich man and the talents, for which Origen and Eusebius are our only authorities, and deals with them without explanation under NG.[8]

Schmidtke's peculiar view of TG as an entirely separate and Gnostic work, and his identification of HG with EG, are both rejected by Moffatt and Findlay, who follow Waitz in accepting the usual equation EG=TG and regarding this work as different from the other two. The difference between the two theories may be thus expressed—while both posit three Gospels, Schmidtke's three are HG (EG), NG, TG; those of Waitz and the English writers are HG, NG, EG (TG).

In opposition to these various hypotheses, my own view is that the older theory of two Jewish Christian Gospels only is probably sound, and that the argument for the separation of HG and NG is

[1] *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*, p. 78 f.
[2] *Contemporary Review*, Jan. 1905, p. 121.
[3] *The Sayings of Jesus from Oxyrhynchus*, p. xlix f.
[4] *Texte und Untersuchungen*, xxxvii. 1.
[5] *ZNTW*, xiii. p. 338 f., xiv. p. 38 f., 117 f.
[6] See chap. ii. of the work cited in the text.
[7] *Op. cit.* p. 489 f.
[8] See p. 58; he also incorrectly refers in this connexion to Ignatius' 'Ephesians' instead of 'Smyrneans.'

not proven. This is Streeter's view,[1] and presumably also that of James, who though referring on a minor point to Schmidtke makes no mention of the idea that HG and NG may not have been the same.[2] There are several points that must be raised against the newer view:

(1) Stress is laid on Eusebius' statement referred to above that Hegesippus used *two* Gospels. But it is not certain that he meant this, nor is it clear that, if he did, they are to be identified with HG and NG. McGiffert thinks the first καὶ should be omitted, translating thus: 'And from the Syriac Gospel according to the Hebrews he quotes some passages in the Hebrew tongue.'[3] Nicholson inclines to this view, but makes several other suggestions, amongst them that τοῦ Συριακοῦ may have been a Syriac version of some parts of the New Testament.[4] There seems to be some likelihood that a Syriac edition of Matthew was in existence quite early.[5]

(2) The fact that Origen twice cites from HG the odd saying about 'my mother, the Holy Spirit,' which Jerome quotes thrice from NG, cannot be lightly put on one side. Can we really suppose that two Gospels bearing the same name each contained this remarkable passage?

(3) Another connexion between HG and NG is found in the following series of links. Clement (Alex.) quotes a saying (which is also the first saying on Oxyrhynchus Papyrus, 654) to which there is a reference in 2 Clement; now the latter work is known to have used one or more uncanonical Gospels (or collections of Gospel material) and one of its citations agrees with one of the marginal notes from τὸ Ἰουδαικόν—another of which proves the identity of τὸ Ἰουδαικόν with NG. This does not amount to proof that HG and NG were the same, but it perhaps slightly increases the probability that they were.[6]

(4) Regarding the Ignatian passage, the source of which is variously stated, the fact that Origen and Jerome differ is not very important, for the passage may have been in both books, or Origen may have been quoting loosely without verifying his reference. Eusebius' statement is perplexing, however, if he was acquainted with HG. But one point does not appear to have been noticed in this connexion: it is only in the *Theophania* that he *quotes* from HG—the references in his *Church History* (an earlier work) would all be quite possible if he knew of the book but had not handled it. And in one of the two quotations in the *Theophania* he speaks of it as 'the Gospel in Hebrew characters which has come to us' (τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς ἦκόν Ἑβραϊκοῖς χαρακτῆρσν εὐαγγέλιον), where the meaning may perhaps be 'which has recently reached us' rather than 'which has been transmitted to us.' In other words, Eusebius' ignorance of the source of the quotation in Ignatius may well have been due to the fact that he had at that time no first-hand acquaintance with 'Hebrews.'

(5) The difficulty regarding Clement's ignorance of Aramaic seems sufficiently met by Evelyn White's contention that an early translation into Greek is probable both on *a priori* grounds and in view of the use made of the book by Clement and others, and he argues that by the time of Jerome this translation may well have largely disappeared before the increasing authority of the Canonical Gospels.[7]

The conclusion I come to, then, is that this theory of HG and NG being separate works is far from being proved. The modification of it suggested by Findlay, that they were two different editions of the same Gospel,[8] is less open to criticism. I shall, therefore, use the expression 'Hebrews' as comprising both HG and NG, only again employing that notation when dealing with writers who thus distinguish them. The Ebionite Gospel we will not further consider here.

II.

Accepting, then, the traditional view that the extant fragments quoted from a Hebrew Gospel all derive from a single document (except such as clearly belong to the Ebionite book), our task now is to investigate the probable nature of this writing. In view of its evident connexion with the Synoptics, three types of theory are obviously possible, all of which in varying forms have been advocated: it may be considered the offspring, a collateral relation, or an ancestor, of one or more of them.

(1) First, it may be held that it also, like the Ebionite Gospel, was secondary—a modified form of canonical Matthew. Neglecting earlier writers,

[1] *The Four Gospels*, p. 283, footnote.
[2] *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 1.
[3] *Nicene Fathers*, vol. i. p. 200.
[4] *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*, p. 6.
[5] The similarities between Syr. C. and some of the extant fragments of the Hebrew Gospel, long ago discussed by Cureton (in the introduction to his edition, p. lxxix f.), and the odd facts about Syr. S. to which Margoliouth has called attention (*Exp.* Jan. 1914), alike seem to point in this direction.
[6] See also Moffatt, *op. cit.* p. 495, footnote.
[7] *Op. cit.* p. liii.
[8] *Op. cit.* p. 56.

we may notice several recent expressions of this view. Evelyn White argued that 'Hebrews' was a rewritten Matthew with Lucan colouring—of little or no value.[1] As we have seen, Moffatt distinguishes between HG and NG; the former he apparently thinks an amplified Matthew, but in the case of NG he is more inclined to allow for the incorporation of reliable traditions. 'It is still a question,' he says, 'how far the text and traditions of NG represent earlier forms than those of the Synoptic narrative.'[2] Findlay, following Schmidtke, is of the opinion that fanciful embellishments (HG) and targumistic additions (NG) explain all the facts.[3] Streeter, though as we shall see himself preferring a different view, maintains in regard to certain of the fragments that even if we feel compelled to accept the theory of the dependence of 'Hebrews' on Matthew, 'we must still assume that the text has been influenced by interpolation of parallel versions of these particular sayings current in oral tradition.'[4]

(2) Secondly, it may be thought that we have in 'Hebrews' a variant working over of some of the sources (oral or written) underlying the canonical Gospels—so that the surviving fragments may preserve some portions of them or points in them neglected by the Evangelists. Nicholson thought the compiler of canonical Matthew also wrote 'Hebrews,' much in the way that Luke is often supposed to have put out two editions of his Gospel and of Acts;[5] Menzies, that the realistic touches of 'Hebrews' are 'signs of an earlier stage of the tradition which, while the Church outgrew it, survived among the "Hebrews"';[6] Burkitt, that one passage at least (No. 4 below) 'bears all the marks of superior originality to the parallels' in the Gospels, and that the Gospel was a sort of 'first cousin' to canonical Matthew.[7] Oscar Holtzmann uses it as a valuable and independent authority on a level with Luke—with which he thinks it most akin.[8] Streeter advocates the idea of overlapping between its sources and those of the Synoptics, and throws out the suggestion 'that the same Jerusalem tradition which we have postulated as the source M used by Matthew was incorporated in, or in some other way affected the text of, that lost Gospel.'[9]

(3) Thirdly, it may be argued that there has been dependence not of 'Hebrews' on the Synoptics but *vice versa*—that 'Hebrews' was one of the sources on which one or more of them drew. In its older form (that 'Hebrews' was actually the Aramaic original of Matthew) this is no longer held.[10] The attempt of Robinson Smith to posit 'Hebrews' as the earliest Gospel on which all the rest were based must be regarded as fanciful and uncritical,[11] as also Schonfield's recent slight reference to the possibility.[12] H. J. Holtzmann and Bacon called attention to the points of contact between Luke and 'Hebrews,' and thought that the question ought to be seriously considered whether the latter in its earliest form was not Luke's special source.[13] Bacon's chief argument impressed me strongly at first. It is difficult to think that there is no literary connexion between the opening verses of the pericope adulteræ (Jn 7^{53}–8^{2}) and Lk $21^{37.38}$; if the story stood in Luke's source at that point and he did not desire to use it, his two verses are exactly what we might expect would be inserted as a summary of the situation. Moreover, the paragraph is actually found just there in the Ferrar MSS. Now, Eusebius tells us that some such narrative occurred in Papias and the Hebrew Gospel; may not 'Hebrews,' then, have been before Luke as he wrote? There are other possible interpretations of the facts, however. Blass, for example, thinks Luke issued two editions of the Gospel, including this incident in one, excluding it from the other;[14] again, Luke may have found it in his special source or in some other document, and 'Hebrews' and Papias may both have drawn it from there. But further, the strength of the tradition that 'Hebrews' and Matthew were especially linked, and the fact that the Greek scholia mentioned above refer to Matthew, not Luke, appear to make the theory quite untenable. It is only fair to add that Bacon has apparently altered his view on the matter, for in his recent work *The Gospel of Mark*, though not dealing directly with the facts just mentioned, he remarks, 'Such fragments as we actually possess of uncanonical Aramaic Gospels prove beyond

[1] *Op. cit.* p. lv f.
[2] *Op. cit.* p. 493, footnote.
[3] *Op. cit.* pp. 62, 64.
[4] *Op. cit.* p. 240.
[5] *Op. cit.* p. 104 f.
[6] *HDB*, v. p. 343.
[7] *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 342.
[8] *Life of Jesus*, Eng. tr., pp. 46–52.
[9] *Op. cit.* p. 283.
[10] This was Hilgenfeld's view; Menzies, *HDB*, v. p. 342.
[11] *The Solution of the Synoptic Problem* (1920).
[12] *An Old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew's Gospel*, p. 195.
[13] See Bacon's article in *Exp.*, March 1905, where reference is made to Holtzmann as adducing 'no small amount of evidence for an exceptional dependence of our third and fourth evangelists on "the Gospel according to the Hebrews"' (p. 174).
[14] *Philology of the Gospels*, p. 160.

question that they are secondary and dependent upon our canonical Greek Gospels.'[1]

My own view belongs to the second of these three classes, and is developed from Streeter's hint mentioned above. There certainly seems some reason for thinking that in some way or another M and 'Hebrews' were connected. Streeter's point is that there are several passages where parallels between Matthew and Luke are not close enough to make derivation from Q probable, the more likely solution being that Q and M both contained it, Luke reproducing Q, Matthew conflating Q and M—and that in two of these cases 'Hebrews' is known to have had a version from which such a conflation might well have been made. I would add this important consideration, that several facts about 'Hebrews' accord well with the idea that it, like M, drew upon a cycle of tradition associated with James, the Lord's brother; the resurrection appearance to James, and the baptism conversation between Jesus and his brethren, point in this direction, while the two agrapha on brotherliness quoted below, the incident of the rich man, and the stress on sinful speech, are all singularly akin in spirit to the Epistle of James.

It is necessary here to recall Streeter's hypothesis that canonical Matthew was the outcome of a *rapprochement* between the pro-Gentile party at Antioch and the Judaizing party. He thinks that after the disturbance in Jerusalem in 62 A.D. when James, the Lord's brother, was slain, refugees probably fled to Antioch—where there was a Church whose practical sympathy they had already experienced (Ac $11^{29.30}$)—and carried with them M, whether in writing or in memory. Its Judaistic interpretation of the Gospel, in contrast to the pro-Gentile movement so strong at Antioch, would fan the controversy between the two sections of the Church there of which we read in Acts and Galatians; when shortly afterwards the Gospel according to St. Mark arrived from Rome (as in due course it must have done) with the authority of that growingly important Church and of St. Peter himself behind it, it would be welcomed by the more liberal party, and for a time it and M would be used side by side, though not without some sense of partisanship. Then presently the natural thing would be for some one to attempt a compromise by preparing a local edition of Mark, with large portions of M and Q incorporated in it—Matthew being the result.[2]

[1] P. 58; on p. 205 he summarizes and accepts Schmidtke's position, without, however, mentioning him.

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 512.

Now, this reconstruction of events hardly seems to me to do justice to Q. If it was, as Streeter thinks, 'the old Gospel of the pro-Gentile Church of Antioch,'[3] may we not suppose that it and M were for a while rivals there, and that the arrival of Mark provided the opportunity for the *rapprochement* represented by Matthew? If so, it is perhaps possible to carry speculation a stage further and to surmise that 'Hebrews' was the Gospel of the Judaizing Christians who objected to this compromise. They would naturally wish to use the work that bore the impress of Peter as well as their own cherished reminiscences of James, and some sort of fusion of M and Mark (the former probably predominating) would appear to me a more feasible explanation of 'Hebrews' than any other so far put forward. Certainly very few of these known fragments of it presuppose Q, though it would not be unlikely that such a document might borrow a few unobjectionable passages from its rival; but it must always be remembered that the contents of Q are by no means certain, Streeter's arguments regarding overlapping being especially important here.[4] The fact that our chief evidence regarding 'Hebrews' came from Berœa (Aleppo), a city some 50 miles inland from Antioch, is of interest; it may well be that a disaffected minority withdrew there when the pro-Gentile movement became too strong.

This is, of course, all very hypothetical, but it seems to cover most of the data, including the fact that there is a greater similarity between 'Hebrews' and Matthew than between it and either of the other Synoptics; it also provides a reasonable explanation of the perplexing fact that although several stories are found in 'Hebrews' in a longer form than in any of the Synoptics (no doubt because they were filled out with material from M neglected by the compiler of Matthew), yet, in spite of these longer narratives and the retention of certain sayings and incidents which Matthew omitted, 'Hebrews' was considerably shorter than Matthew. It should just be added that there is, of course, a probability that by the time of Eusebius and Jerome corruptions had crept in, so that it is not likely that everything of 'Hebrews' that survives is primitive, even if its origin be somewhat as suggested.

III.

Now it is evident that if we hold this theory regarding the Hebrew Gospel, we must scrutinize

[3] *Op. cit.* p. 291; cp. 233.

[4] *Op. cit.* pp. 186, 239, etc.

with great care the extant fragments of it since they may not improbably contain valuable and authentic portions of M. If, on the other hand, it was in some other way a variant manipulation of certain of the sources of the Synoptics, the possibility still cannot be ruled out that early and true elements were preserved in it; while, as the citations from Moffatt and Streeter show, even if we think it was secondary, primitive details may still have been incorporated. Our task now, therefore, is to gather the more important fragments (containing agrapha) which appear to belong to the precanonical period or at least to be contemporaneous with the Synoptics, and therefore quite possibly of value.

(1) 'Behold, the mother of the Lord and his brethren said unto him, John the Baptist baptizeth unto the remission of sins: let us go and be baptized by him. But he said unto them, Wherein have I sinned that I should go and be baptized by him? unless, perhaps, this very thing that I have said is ignorance.' [1]

This reads very much like a real reminiscence of the brothers of Jesus, and it is quite natural to suppose both that they would make some such suggestion to Him and that they would recall it later on when their unbelief had passed (Ac 1^{14}). Further, this is just the sort of saying that would tend to be either neglected or combated as appearing to hint at imperfection; [2] it is interesting to notice that the only other patristic reference to the story is as we should expect, one that denies it on this ground.[3] It is for reasons of this kind that it has generally been regarded as authentic, at least in essence. Menzies thinks that the words attributed to Jesus 'could not have been invented'; [4] Harnack, that it is 'the most ancient preliminary history of the baptism that we know,' and that its ambiguity as to whether or not Jesus was conscious of His own sinlessness is a sign of genuineness; [5] Oscar Holtzmann, that 'an utterance like this would never have found a place in any Gospel unless it had actually fallen from the lips of Jesus.' [6] Nicholson [7] and Blomfield Jackson [8] also accept it; Ropes regards it as doubtful, but possibly including some genuine element.[9] On the other hand, Resch,[10] Stanton,[11] and Findlay regard the story as unhistorical, the latter thinking it merely an attempt to deal with the commonly felt difficulty as to why Jesus was baptized.[12] He suggests that the words ascribed to Jesus are intended to imply His dawning consciousness that, in spite of His sinlessness, baptism yet had a meaning for Him—as an act of self-abnegation and to emphasize the completeness of His sympathy with sinners—and that ignorance refers simply to His failure at first to appreciate this.

Now, there is one point that does not seem to me to have been sufficiently considered. The words of Jesus here appear to suit exactly what we may feel was His spiritual condition at this time. The canonical story of the baptism probably represents something of His own thought upon that matter, and it evidently indicates that it was not until then that He fully realized His Divine commission. We shall surely be right if we think of Him as having hitherto lived a stainless life and as having come gradually to the conviction that God was calling Him to service in some way or another. But to suppose that prior to this occasion He had had a full realization of His person and purpose is contrary to all probability and to His own statement of the revelation that now came to Him. And the consciousness of purity and yet the sense of uncertainty preserved in the saying we are studying seem precisely what might be expected in this period of transition. To regard the baptism as an act of self-humbling in order that He might be 'numbered with the transgressors'—as Findlay does—rather than as a crisis in which illumination came to its perfection is to miss the psychological significance of the event and its historical place in the development of the story.

I consider, then, that we have here a fragment of early and reliable tradition, and an agraphon of real importance.

(*To be concluded.*)

[1] Jerome, *Against Pelag.*, iii. 2.

[2] Cf. Mk $6^{5.6}$, a very remarkable statement which Matthew varies to avoid the suggestions of impotence and surprise.

[3] Pseudo-Cyprian, *De Rebaptismate*, xvii.

[4] *Op. cit.* p. 341.

[5] As quoted by Findlay, *op. cit.* p. 70, and Stanton, *The Gospels as Historical Documents*, vol. i. p. 255.

[6] *Op. cit.* p. 47.

[7] *Op. cit.* p. 37.

[8] *Twenty-five Agrapha*, p. 50.

[9] *HDB*, v. p. 346.

[10] *Agrapha*, p. 234.

[11] *Loc. cit.*

[12] *Op. cit.* p. 66.

The Sermon on the Mount.

How Jesus dealt with Worry (Mt. vi. 19–34).

By the Reverend D. M. Baillie, M.A., Cupar.

I.

To begin with, it is highly interesting to observe, as we cannot help doing when we read the Gospels, that Jesus did explicitly and repeatedly deal with the problem of worry. It is one of the perennial problems of human life, and, like the other human problems and ills, it was tackled by Christianity from the very beginning. The phrase which in the A.V. is rendered 'Take no thought,' and in the R.V. 'Be not anxious,' has sometimes been rendered, and not unhappily, by the colloquial English 'Don't worry'; and that phrase goes sounding through the New Testament, from the Sermon on the Mount onwards. 'Don't worry about food and drink and clothing,' said Jesus. 'Don't worry about to-morrow.' 'Don't worry about what you are going to say' when you are brought to trial for your faith. And Paul, who had learnt his Master's lessons so well, said to his Philippian friends, 'Don't worry about anything.' And another disciple counselled his fellow-Christians to 'cast all their worry on God.' The same word comes in so often, whether as noun or as verb, to show us how conscious those early Christians were of this problem and of its solution.

It seems quite plain from the Gospels that Jesus was greatly struck by the amount of worry there was in the world, spoiling human life, and interfering with the really high and noble interests of the human soul. He saw around Him men and women whose lives were being marred by carking care about the mere externals of life. He saw that a great many people were so obsessed by these anxieties as to have no leisure of mind left for finer things. And it was not only one class, but all classes.

Sometimes it was the poor He was thinking of and speaking to when He spoke of worry. There was plenty of poverty in Galilee. It was not very easy, in the lower ranks of life, to make a living and to keep a roof over the head of a large family and fill the mouths of hungry children. Probably Jesus knew that part of the situation by personal experience: He knew the circumstances that make people worry about provision for the morrow, since He was the eldest of a large family, and probably its chief breadwinner from an early age, if, as seems likely, His mother was left a widow when the children were still young. Certainly Jesus had warm sympathy with the poor, and His words about their daily anxieties have the unmistakable note of compassion. Moreover, we must think that Jesus frequently had the experience of preaching to people who were so pre-occupied with the cares of the mere struggle for existence that they could not find leisure of mind to attend to the intangible realities of religion. There He was with a mysterious message about a coming Kingdom of God, a message that made big demands on the people that would accept it, calling them to high and heroic levels of conduct in preparation for the Kingdom. And how could the poor folk attend to all that? They loved to listen to Him, but then they had to go home and think of household needs—of where the money was to come from for next day's food, of how to eke out a small and uncertain wage for a large family, of what might happen if they had a period of unemployment, if 'no man hired them.' It was hard enough to make one's way through the world at all: how could they give their minds to an unpractical thing, that didn't bring in any money, like this dream of a coming Kingdom? That was how the poor sometimes felt; and Jesus could see it in their faces, and was very sorry for them: their lives were being so spoiled by worry about the mere business of making a livelihood, so impoverished and side-tracked and hindered from the enjoyment of the things that really make life worth living.

But sometimes when Jesus spoke of worry He must have been thinking, not of the poor, with their struggle for existence, but of the rich or those who were feverishly struggling to become rich. In the interpretation of the Parable of the Sower we find 'the worries of this world' put alongside of 'the deceitfulness of riches' among the things that choke the word of religion in the human heart; and whether the interpretation of the parable be accepted as representing the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus or not, this part of it savours unmistakably of His outlook. We sometimes say, with pity, that it is almost impossible for the very poor to find room in their lives for the interests of religion, but Jesus felt that kind of pity rather for the *rich*: it was for

them that salvation was almost impossible! The greatest danger of all was that people should let their 'hearts be burdened with over-indulgence and drunkenness and worldly worries,' and so be utterly unready for the Kingdom. Jesus saw around Him people who were so engrossed in the quest of wealth, so obsessed by what Tennyson calls 'the narrowing lust of gold,' that they were blind to everything most worth seeing. They had no eyes even for the beauty of the world around them, for the little sparrows rolling themselves in the dust and enjoying themselves in the sunshine, free from care, or for the wild flowers of the countryside, arrayed more gloriously than the fabulously rich King Solomon. It must have been of these people, as well as of the poor, that Jesus was thinking, even in the great passage about worry and care in the 'Sermon on the Mount.' This is plain in Matthew's version, where the passage against worry begins with the danger of laying up treasure on earth instead of in Heaven, and of trying to serve Mammon as well as God; but it is still plainer in Luke's version, where the whole passage (separated from the 'Sermon') is so naturally introduced by the Parable of the Rich Fool, who (very unlike the birds, that 'have neither storehouse nor barn') was obsessed by the idea of enlarging his barns, whose worries were caused by his having so much of this world's goods. Upon such people Jesus must have looked with a profound pity; they were making such a miserable thing of their lives.

And between these two extremes of the rich and the poor He saw all possible degrees. But in all the degrees there were so many people whose hearts were set mainly upon possessions; and when people's hearts are so set, their degrees of wealth make little difference to their worries, for they are always poorer than they would like to be, and they strive to become a little richer, without limit. And so they become pre-occupied with 'the cares of this world,' which we nowadays call 'business worries,' and life becomes clouded over with anxiety. Jesus saw it all around Him. People were going about with care upon their faces, with worry upon their brows. People were going through life like that. They were being dogged by worry. And Jesus set Himself to deal with this evil.

II.

How did He deal with it? For one thing, He pointed out, simply as a matter of common sense, or perhaps we should say, of broad human wisdom, that worry never does any good. It doesn't help. That is a lesson that one learns, though slowly and unwillingly, as one goes through life; and Jesus taught it plainly. 'Which of you can add a cubit to his height by worrying about it?' Does this perhaps carry with it the idea that worry does more harm than good, that it is bad even for the healthy growth of the body, that an anxious mind doesn't help the body's functions, but rather hinders them, that no one ever throve on worry? Probably Jesus' meaning was rather this: that the whole realm of things about which people are worried and anxious is such a tiny fraction of their lives, and makes so little difference. People consume themselves with care about food and clothing, and it really makes very little difference to their lives whether they get much or little of these accessories. All their feverish anxiety is about things that are the merest fringe of life. Life itself is a far bigger thing, mysterious and beyond our control, with fixed conditions that with all our anxious care we cannot alter. 'Life is more than food, and the body is more than clothes.' When with much worry you succeed in growing rich, your body (not to speak of your soul) is not any the better of all the trouble you took on its behalf. You are no better off than the sparrows who don't worry about it at all, and you will clothe your body in ugly garments which at their very best cannot compare with the beauty of the wild flowers that spin no yarn at all. How little all your fuss goes for! How little you can really do! How little difference *that* sort of thing makes! Why let your life be spoilt by constant anxiety about it? And as for the habit of going to meet possible troubles before they come, crossing streams before you reach them, 'worrying about to-morrow,' that is a foolish habit, which people must learn to put away. To take one day at a time, and deal with problems only as they arise, and refuse to waste time and strength in worrying about the contingencies of the future, is a fundamental and elementary secret of getting through life. 'To-morrow will take care of itself: to-day's troubles are enough for to-day.' These simple sayings sum up and deepen all that the ripest human wisdom has ever said about the foolishness and futility of the habit of worrying.

III.

But that is only a beginning. For however futile and foolish the habit may be, and however clearly we see it, we may yet be quite unable to overcome the habit. That is what common sense perpetually replies to its own wise counsels on this subject:

granted that worry does no good, nevertheless it *will* come and haunt the mind and will not be driven away. How can we help having anxious and troubled minds when times are bad and cares are pressing?

It is here that we come to the heart of Jesus' teaching on the subject, namely, His counsel of faith in God.

There is no doubt that in our Lord's mind this lesson was connected with His appreciation of Nature, and we may well imagine that He found help in this region Himself when He was tempted to give way to anxieties. Nothing is plainer in the Gospels than His quiet sympathetic perception of the life of the world of Nature around Him; and it may be that when He was burdened with the cares of that large household at Nazareth He derived comfort and peace from the contemplation, some summer day, of the little birds and the wild flowers, and ever afterwards took that way of helping other people against their worries. Many a sage or singer of Israel had looked at the flowers of the field, which fade so quickly, and found in them a sad reminder of man's mortality. But when Jesus looked at the flowers it was with very different feelings: He was moved by the thought of their wonderful beauty, of the trouble God had taken to devise such beauty for flowers that were to bloom one day and perish the next; and this was to Him a source of glad and peaceful thoughts. 'If God so clothe the grass of the field, which is there to-day and is thrown into the oven to-morrow, will he not much more clothe you, O you people of little faith?' The gist of it all is that worry can have no place in the hearts of those who really believe and trust in God. How could it? The Gentiles worry about food and drink and clothing: that is what makes up life for the godless world. 'But *your* heavenly Father knows you need all that. Therefore *you* make His Kingdom your first care, and all that will come.' It is curious how the distinction is drawn between 'the Gentiles' and '*you*,' precisely as in the passage about greatness and service, as if Jesus thought of the Kingdom as an *Israel* of God. But the main religious point is quite clear: that religion ought to save us from worry, that people who believe in God as their heavenly Father ought not to be obsessed by the cares of life, but should have care-free minds for the quest of His Kingdom; and indeed that those who really trust in God *will not* have anxious minds. Worry is a sign of 'little faith,' and the one cure for it is more faith. Dr. Abrahams quoted a saying from Rabbi Eleazar the Great (first century): 'Whoever has bread in his basket and asks, What shall I eat to-morrow? is none other than those of little faith.' But whatever we think of the relation of this to the sayings we find in the Gospels, there was in the teaching of Jesus nothing more individual and characteristic than His diagnosis of unbelief or little faith as the source of all sorts of weakness and failure and worry among men, and His prescription of faith as the cure. To Him the secret of the untroubled mind was not passionlessness, suppression of desire, submission, resignation, but something much more positive and joyful and adventurous: it was faith in God. And it seems really to have puzzled Him that people who professed to believe in God should worry so much. He was continually surprised at that kind of thing. How could people keep on worrying about little things if they really believed in the Heavenly Father who feeds the birds and arrays the flowers and will much more take care of His children? The one unfailing cure for worry was faith in God.

IV.

It is highly important to observe how much this faith involved, and to understand what this counsel really meant. When we are burdened with the cares of the world, in what sense are we to cast them upon God, and put our trust in Him? What are we to believe He will do for us? In what way will faith save us from worry? Here is a man who has set his heart upon 'success' and prosperity, upon climbing the ladder of wealth and position; and in the struggle he becomes a prey to anxious care, his heart is consumed with worry. What counsel does the Sermon on the Mount offer him when he seeks a cure for worry? The Christian counsel has sometimes been taken to be: Trust in God and carry on, and you will prosper, with the blessing of God which maketh rich. It has sometimes been reduced to a very worldly interpretation of the ancient Psalmist's counsel: 'Commit thy way unto the Lord; trust also in him, and he shall bring it to pass'; as if faith in God were something that could be added like a talisman to the most worldly life, and as if the cares created for us by our most selfish ambitions could be daily cast upon God, that He might give us our hearts' desire and save us from worry as we seek for riches. But Jesus meant something very different. He meant such a faith in God as would lift us above our worldly cares by making us live for different things altogether. That is abundantly plain in the Sermon on the Mount, when it speaks of worry. We need not discuss the question whether Jesus was through-

out addressing those who had already left all and followed Him (a question which is complicated not only by the uncertainty about the setting of the 'Sermon on the Mount' itself, but also by the fact that in Luke the passage on worry is separated from the Sermon and forms a separate discourse). For the whole subject of worry is closely bound up, in this section of the teaching of Jesus, whether in Matthew or in Luke, with the question of the true and the false riches and the corresponding ambitions between which the human heart has to choose. The cure for worry is faith in God, but this faith in God involves a very revolution in a man's outlook. It means that he is no longer going to live for the kind of treasure that can be destroyed by moth and rust and stolen by thieves. So long as a man does live for these things there is no possible escape from worry. He can't cast these cares upon God, for God has no interest in keeping a man rich. He does not really believe in the Kingdom of God, but in the earthly treasure. He cannot know what it is to have that faith in God which frees our hearts for the seeking of His Kingdom. For a man who clings to the worldly outlook there is no end to worry. You can't have it both ways, for 'no one can serve two masters,' and 'wherever your treasure is, your heart will be there too.' You can't solve this problem at all unless you are willing to get your aim right—to give up the worldly aim, and live for the things that really matter: *everything* depends on getting your aim right. 'The lamp of the body is the eye: so, if your eye is single, your whole body will be full of light; but if your eye is wrong, your whole body will be full of darkness.' All these sayings stand together in the passage on worry in Matthew, to show us that Jesus' solution of the problem of worry was no isolated specific for an isolated disease, but a part of His one great message about committing oneself absolutely to God. To live for petty and material things—that is the world's way, and it involves us in 'the world's worries'; but Christian faith involves and implies a different way. 'After all these things do the Gentiles seek. But *your* heavenly Father knows you need all these things: *you* seek first his Kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things will be added.' And that is an end of worry.

V.

There are two difficulties that may yet remain in our minds. In the first place: Can even this high doctrine of Jesus reasonably save a man from worry amid all the complications of the modern world? Of course Jesus did not mean to discourage honest toil and forethought in the quest of a livelihood. But in the modern struggle for existence a man cannot, with all his forethought, even be certain of getting work and keeping it, and so being able to give to his family those worthy opportunities which even the most unworldly parent must wish his children to have. And in what sense can such a man, in bad times, be expected to put away all care and have faith that he and his family will not suffer? Well, this is not the kind of question that one can presume to answer glibly from an arm-chair. But let us humbly remind ourselves again that what we have here is but part of an all-round doctrine with which Jesus challenged all the difficulties of human life, that heroic doctrine of the omnipotence of faith which in many ways, apart from the problem at present before us, we find so staggering. Jesus taught that if only people would have faith in God all the obstacles and impossibilities of life would marvellously disappear. Perhaps we have hardly begun to take this seriously. But we are beginning to understand that in very truth faith can work wonders, and that no limits can be set to its achievement; and so perhaps we are more ready to believe that this counsel of faith is the very best and most practical advice that could be given even to an individual who has to struggle for existence amid the complicated evils of a materialistic modern civilization. And if the advice were to be *universally* carried out, or if all who profess to be Christians were to begin to live in the heroic spirit that Jesus commended, seeking first God's Kingdom, instead of their own advancement, in their daily avocations, it seems certain that not only worry but poverty and want would disappear from Christendom.

But then here is the other difficulty. When we do begin to care for God's Kingdom instead of our own enrichment, do not we inherit greater worries than ever, since there are no anxieties like those of religion and no burdens so heavy as those of the Kingdom of God? How can we help worrying about these things if we care for them? Well, there is no doubt that here too Jesus would apply His deep lesson of 'Don't worry,' and for a very deep reason. His followers should not think of the Kingdom of God with fear and anxiety, but with confidence and joy. 'Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom.' They need not torment themselves with anxiety as to their defence of themselves or their faith if they should be haled to courts of justice. 'Don't worry beforehand as to what you are going to say, for what you should say will be given you when the time

comes—it is not you that speak, it is your Father's Spirit that speaks in you.' These spiritual cares also are to be cast upon God. Or rather (and here we come back again to the heart of the matter) it is just these cares that can especially be cast upon Him. So long as your cares are 'the cares of the world,' the anxieties of a selfish and worldly life, you are bound to be worried, for you have to bear them alone, since these are not God's cares and they can't possibly be cast upon Him. But when, with real faith in God, you begin to live for different things altogether, your new cares of God's Kingdom are indeed far bigger than your old cares of the world, but then *they are God's cares*, and so you can have a quiet mind. From start to finish, according to Jesus, worry comes of living for the wrong things, and the other side of that is lack of faith; while the cure for worry is to commit oneself in faith to God and live for His Kingdom. And then:

I have no cares, O blessed Will,
For all my cares are Thine.

Literature.

ANGLICAN ESSAYS.

Still another composite work: *Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation* (Longmans; 21s. net), by Members of the Anglican Communion, edited by the Rev. A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D., Student of Christ Church, Oxford. This work, as Dr. Rawlinson explains, originated in the meetings for theological discussion of a group of friends who were all at one time engaged in the teaching of theology or of philosophy at Oxford. But Mr. A. D. Nock, who contributes the longest of the Essays, writes not from a theological nor a philosophical standpoint, but from the standpoint of an historian of religion. His subject is, 'Early Gentile Christianity and its Hellenistic Background,' and it is a subject on which fresh guidance is always welcome. The author is in close touch with the important body of continental literature which deals with it, and is successful in presenting it in an exposition which is at once clear and cautious. It is interesting to find Mr. Nock suggesting, as Dr. Burch does in a recent volume (reviewed in another column), that the high place accorded to St. John the Baptist in the Mandæan literature is a reflection, not a contributory cause, of the high place occupied by Jesus Christ in the Fourth Gospel.

The other Essays, seven in number, are more closely connected with the main theme. The Editor writes on 'Hebraic Theism,' the Rev. F. D. V. Narborough on 'The Christ,' the Rev. K. E. Kirk on 'The Evolution of the Doctrine of the Trinity,' the Rev. F. W. Green on 'The Later Development of the Doctrine of the Trinity,' the Rev. F. H. Brabant on 'Augustine and Plotinus' and 'God and Time,' and the Rev. Leonard Hodgson on 'The Incarnation.' All these essays, divergent as they may be from one another in matters of detail, are informed with the common conviction that Christ is not less than Divine, and Christianity involves a distinctive doctrine of God.

While the Essays, all seven of them, are useful contributions to their respective themes, and those by Dr. Kirk and Mr. Green are solidly informative on the doctrinal development as far as Augustine, Mr. Brabant's essay on 'God and Time' will be regarded by many as the most interesting, in respect both of subject and of style. He claims that his standpoint, which he puts forward in view of modern discussions, seems to be the one that is most in accordance with the main stream of Catholic tradition, namely, that 'the Time-process is real, but less real than the Eternal, dependent upon it, and, as it were, an offshoot of the Eternal, but to be re-absorbed into it, as it arose out of it; that Time is "the moving image of eternity," the growth-side of eternal fact, and yet with a certain freedom and contingency of its own (God letting His eternal decrees work themselves out through us).'

MOFFATT'S COMMENTARY.

Dr. Moffatt's translation of the New Testament gave many readers a fresh insight into phrases and sentences and whole books which familiarity with the Authorized Version rendered obscure and opaque. It was itself a commentary, but it was felt that further comment was necessary in order to justify and even to explain the alterations, transpositions, and corrections of the old version.

This new commentary, of which we have here the first two volumes—one by Dr. Moffatt himself on *The General Epistles of Peter, James,* and *Judas,* the other by Dr. T. H. Robinson, of Cardiff—a well-known O.T. scholar—on *The Gospel of Matthew* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 8s. 6d. net each), is the first-fruits of this undertaking. Dr. Moffatt, in a common foreword, explains the genesis, the aim, and the structure of the series, namely, 'to bring out the religious meaning and message of the N.T. writings.' While 'written for the Greekless,' the volumes can be relied on for scholarship without pedantry, and each scholar is to be left free to give his own views on the Gospel or Epistle assigned to him, but the general aim is to elucidate the spiritual meaning of the N.T., which was written that men might believe 'that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God'—to bring modern men to see Him as the N.T. writers saw Him.

We have read both these volumes with care and feel sure that they will be found, by what they omit as much as by what they include, a welcome, timely and trustworthy help to those who desire to understand the N.T. and to see Jesus. The introductions are short and relevant, the text is carefully expounded, intricate discussions are avoided—painfully obvious homiletic is discarded, and the emphasis is on the religious message and meaning—on the actual thought of the N.T. writer about Jesus, and about life in the light of Jesus.

Dr. Moffatt's volume is characterized by his well-known gifts of scholarship and literary felicity, by apt illustrative power, and by what is more rare and precious, a true devotional spirit. Difficult passages are explained with simplicity. One is not plunged into all the views held on them—an immense relief to the ordinary reader. We would instance such texts as : 'the spirit lusting to envy,' explained without descent into the fertile vagaries of exegesis ; the 'descent into hell' passage classified by the adoption of Enoch into the text as suggested by Cremer and Rendel Harris, such phrases as 'the day of visitation,' although some may feel that the theological tinge in this phrase is deeper than is here allowed. On the whole, this volume can justify itself among the ever-growing number of commentaries and will be warmly welcomed by hosts of readers.

Dr. Robinson's task was more difficult, but he has performed it well ; and the choice of an O.T. scholar to expound a Gospel that falls back so frequently on O.T. Messianic texts is amply justified. The work is distinguished by simplicity and sanity of treatment not only in the separate sections, but in the general principles of explanation. We wonder if all scholars will agree with the degree of emphasis he places on the possible modification of incidents by O.T. texts that Matthew brings to bear on them. It is difficult to believe that such texts could manufacture facts as the writer seems to suggest, though it is obvious that, given the facts, they are modified and coloured by the texts—a different thing.

With regard to the Nature-miracles, Dr. Robinson hints, if he does not approve of the view, that these were ordinary events worked up unconsciously by the religious imagination. The multiplying of the loaves and fishes may have been a pooling of the resources of the multitude—or a subtle spiritual satisfaction caused by the personal influence of Jesus—but no real miracle. It is certain the Evangelist believed it a miracle, but a miracle congruous with the personal power of Christ. After all, what the ordinary reader desires is not the exegete's private opinions, but the Evangelist's thought—the former might be relegated to an introduction or an appendix. But apart from these doubtful points the book is a helpful, honest, and on the whole a successful contribution to the understanding of Matthew, and we hope the forthcoming volumes will maintain the high standard set by these first two volumes.

THE CASE FOR CHRISTIANITY.

A well-known Professor of Pastoral Theology in Scotland was wont to warn his students against using instruments which were too fine when dealing with rough and hard material. A razor is excellent in its own sphere but useless in a granite quarry, so many a sermon or apologetic address fails because it is utterly unsuited to the case of the ordinary man to whom it is addressed.

The Case for Christianity, by Professor Clement F. Rogers (Allen & Unwin ; 12s. 6d. net), is a most valuable commentary on this excellent advice. The writer is well known for his practical work in defending Christianity in Hyde Park, meeting the popular objections to the Christian faith, not with cumbrous scholastic arguments, but with weapons suited for immediate defence, and level with the difficulties and caricatures of religion in the mind of the man on the street or in the park.

The book is incidentally a revelation of the woeful ignorance and fearful perversity regarding religion in the minds of multitudes of our countrymen. It is a skilful diagnosis of the disease by a man skilled in his work who has actually examined

the patient, and every minister of religion ought to read this volume in order to acquaint himself with the real nature of his task. To prescribe aright, accurate diagnosis must precede and we have it here. It would, however, be a mistake to suppose that there is no scholarship here. There is learning on every page—the very tissue of the argument is steeped in disciplined and well-informed reasoning and knowledge. The book is full of choice quotations—old and new—for like the true scribe he uses all the wealth of ancient and modern authors to help his case, so that the main thread of the argument sparkles with these quotations—all apt and relevant—as a ring sparkles with brilliants. It is thus a kind of armoury of thoughts as well as a closely-knit argument, at once a learned and a popular book.

We are not quite sure if his exposition of the Parable of the Unjust Steward is correct, nor are we quite sure of one or two other points, but these do not affect the general value of the work, and for many a day we have not read a more live book, never out of touch with real issues, and we commend it with all our heart, not only to doubters and deniers of the faith, but to expounders and defenders of the same.

Professor Rogers has done nobly, and his book is sure of wide acceptance and hearty appreciation. He has without lowering his learning or cheapening his reasoning made both alike a human instrument of power for the furtherance of truth.

THE EPIC OF GILGAMISH.

The Epic of Gilgamish, though not exactly familiar except to Semitic scholars, is one of the great influential poems of the world; and though it might not be strictly true to say that it has left its mark upon the Bible, it at any rate furnishes many striking and instructive parallels to passages in the Book of Genesis, to a small extent in the Creation story, and to a much larger degree in the Flood story. Students of Genesis have long been familiar with the Babylonian parallels according to which, when the flood came, the gods 'crouched, cowering like curs,' or, when it began to subside, the hero of the story sent forth from his boat in succession a dove, a swallow, and a raven, or, when at the end he offered his sacrifice, the gods 'assembled like flies' over him—passages which set in relief the immense religious superiority of the Hebrew story to the Babylonian.

But all this is only part of a long and fascinating epic, full of human interest and touching some of the deepest things of human experience, such as the fear of death and the quest of life eternal. Mr. R. Campbell Thompson, M.A., D.Litt., F.S.A., has made it possible for us to read all of the tale that is extant—unhappily much of it is fragmentary and some of the translation highly problematic—and to appreciate something of its literary beauty by presenting this *Epic of Gilgamish* (Luzac & Co., London; 10s. 6d.) in 'a new translation from a collation of the cuneiform tablets in the British Museum rendered literally into English hexameters,' and he prefaces his translation by a succinct but illuminating summary. Though the translation is in verse, the writer has endeavoured to make it 'absolutely literal,' a feat the difficulty of which will be best appreciated by those who have ever made a similar attempt even in languages much less difficult than those with which Dr. Thompson has had to deal. He modestly admits that the choice of the 'ponderous English hexameter' for the rendering of such a poem is open to question, but on this point we think he may keep an easy mind. The effect is in reality both pleasing and worthy. Here are three lines from a beautiful and touching passage which has no Biblical equivalent. When the gale was spent,

(Then) I open'd a hatchway, and down on my cheek stream'd the sunlight,
Bowing myself, I sat weeping, my tears o'er my cheek(s) overflowing,
Into the distance I gazed, to the furthest bounds of the Ocean.

These lines remind us that, in spite of the ethical superiority of the Hebrew narrative, the Babylonian tale is marked not only by literary beauty but by fine and tender feeling; and by his more than readable—we can truly say his admirable—translation, Dr. Thompson has put all students of literature and of the Bible deeply in his debt.

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT.

Professor C. C. J. Webb, M.A., F.B.A., the Oriel Professor of the Philosophy of the Christian Religion in Oxford, has put us in his debt by his valuable contribution to the defence of the religious point of view, and this alone will make his new book, *Religious Thought in the Oxford Movement* (S.P.C.K.; 6s. net), welcome to many. It is, however, extraordinarily interesting in itself, and it is timely in view of the fact that the centenary of the Oxford Movement is near at hand. The aim of the book is to estimate the contribution

which the Oxford Movement made to the Philosophy of Religion.

The central and essential fact about this movement, according to Professor Webb, is its 'Moralism,' a rather unpleasing word which he borrows from Dr. Brilioth. He might easily have found a better word for himself. What is meant, however, is that ethical considerations were at the root of all the thinking of the leaders. Not only were they possessed by a passion for holiness, but they considered that the path of obedience was that by which we ought to approach God. This was the point at which they separated decisively from the evangelicals. Even the Atonement was not to be presented to any one who had not entered on this path already. This was a serious divergence from evangelical tradition.

The same standpoint lies behind their doctrine of Justification. They rather join hands with the Roman contention here. The righteousness that justifies is not imputed but infused righteousness. This also explains their emphasis on Baptismal Regeneration. And finally it explains the fact that to this movement the Incarnation and not the Atonement is the central fact of Christianity.

These and other points are worked out with much interest and pleasure to the reader in this valuable essay. There are passages also of suggestiveness apart from the main stream of thought, such as the elaborate contrast between Romanism and Protestantism. The style is sometimes rather fatiguing. The sentences are often far too long, and are lengthened still more by parentheses. If all this could be broken up into shorter sentences, the reader would find his task pleasanter. But this does not mean that the writing is obscure or difficult. It is neither. But the reader, however attentive, will sometimes find himself stopping and saying, 'Now, where are we?'

THE PROBLEM OF PERSONALITY.

Instinct and Personality, by Mr. A. Campbell Garnett, M.A., Litt.D. (Allen & Unwin; 8s. 6d. net), distinguished by lucidity of statement and unity of aim, is sure to be read with pleasure and profit even by those who may hesitate to assent to the metaphysical conclusions of its final chapter.

The writer attempts to throw light on the problem of personality and the nature of reality by an examination of life and particularly of the life of man. He starts at the very lowest manifestations of living activity, such as the ameba, and his graphic account as given, say, on p. 193 reads like a romance.

It is difficult to disagree with his criticisms and modifications of views on instinct and activity in general held by such distinguished psychologists as McDougall, Prince, Coué, and the various representatives of the new psychology school—Freud, Jung, Adler, and others—and we fancy many a reader will thank him for the lucid exposition given of these views. He finds in all activity what he calls expectation—not simply reaction to stimuli, but a kind of prophetic touch which is the basis of possible progress and which is perhaps best illustrated by the play of young creatures. It is interesting to find him favouring a theory of the Unconscious somewhat similar to the old Lamarckian theory of lapsed intelligence, although he does not mention Lamarck, and one finds a similar tendency in the later work of James Ward.

His chapter on Ideals indicates that he is alive to the necessity of explaining human activity, from above as well as from below, and he might well have elevated his argument by further consideration of the higher realms of experience. It is notoriously easier to expound and criticise than to construct, and we feel unable to follow the writer in his theory of matter (*sic*) as a kind of what was once vitalized, now devitalized. It produces a sense of bewilderment, but it at any rate proves that there is in man a deep metaphysical urge or libido which should not be neglected by those who explain personality by his urges and desires. The influence of psychology is seen by the fact that words like urge, libido, and horme—with the last of which this writer tends to play as a father with a fond child—are become commonplaces not only of psychology but of ordinary speech. We have read this book with keen interest, and congratulate the writer on a notable psychological achievement.

AN AMERICAN ESTIMATE OF SCOTLAND.

Lest we be tempted to think more highly of ourselves than we ought to think, it is good sometimes to see ourselves as others see us, and especially good if the eyes that look at us are kindly as well as critical. Mr. Robert Scott has been looking at the Scottish people out of shrewd yet not unfriendly eyes, and in *Scotland through American Eyes* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. 6d. net) he has in thoroughly interesting fashion recorded what he saw. Mr. Scott has unusually high qualifications for his task, as, though he has spent forty years in the United States—part of that time as Editor of the 'Homiletic Review'—he is a born Scot, and besides frequently revisiting the land of his birth, he has recently

spent a long sojourn in it, observing carefully the phenomena of its varied life. There are chapters, for example, on The Religious, Industrial, Educational, Political, and Social Life, and besides valuable general estimates resting on acute observation and an intimate knowledge of the contemporary press, there are not a few shrewd *obiter dicta*, to which those who believe in the high mission of Scotland would do well to give heed.

There are many things which Mr. Scott admires, and some which he deplores. He admires the humour, the hearty congregational singing, the temper of the people during the great strike. He deplores the often meagre Church attendance, the barn-like architecture of some of the churches, the tendency —in Britain generally—to look to the State for assistance, the adherence to obsolete methods, both in Church and in trade, and the backwardness of the religious education provided by many Sunday Schools, which is 'woefully behind the needs of the time.' But he admits that the Church is still a mighty power in the land, and adds to Lord Haldane's comforting reassurance that 'the British people need never be afraid of Bolshevism in a country like ours' the comment that 'what they have to fear are the results which may follow stagnation.' He is a warm advocate of Home Rule for Scotland and of the study of the vernacular, both of which would strengthen and deepen the interest of Scotsmen in the contribution which Scotland has already made and is yet capable of making to the higher life of the world. The book, which is written with a Scotsman's love of Scotland and with an American's love of fresh and lively comment, is a just appreciation of Scottish ways and traits, alike in their strength and their weakness.

EUSEBIUS.

Some twelve months ago we noticed the publication of a new translation of the 'Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius' by Dr. Lawlor and Mr. Oulton. Their promised second volume is now before us, *Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea—The Ecclesiastical History and the Martyrs of Palestine*, translated with Introduction and Notes by the Rev. H. J. Lawlor, D.D., Litt.D., and the Rev. J. E. L. Oulton, B.D., vol. ii. (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net). In size the two volumes are alike, so that what we have here amounts to a commentary.

The chapters discussing the method followed by 'the Father of Church History,' and estimating the value of his work, are exceedingly well done. The faults of Eusebius, such as his lack of critical ability, his credulity, his partiality, are freely admitted. His frequent strange use of his documents and the errors into which he falls are illustrated. Yet the conviction remains that Eusebius was a man 'of singular genius, and the laborious zeal which he brought to his task deserves the gratitude of all subsequent scholars.' In the Notes, then, we need and we find wise and sure guidance as to where Eusebius requires emendation. The two volumes are a noteworthy testimony to patient study, sound judgment, and trained scholarship.

SPINOZA.

Professor A. Wolf of the University of London is already well known as a writer on philosophical subjects. What will likely turn out to be his *magnum opus* is a complete translation and annotation of all Spinoza's works, which he hopes to finish within the next few years. An instalment lies before us—*The Correspondence of Spinoza*, translated and edited by Professor A. Wolf (Allen & Unwin; 15s. net). The translation is not only accurate but felicitous, and the annotations are illuminating. In an introductory section we have a very suggestive but much too negative and meagre discussion of Spinoza's place in philosophy, and a helpful account of his correspondents. The Letters are valuable as elucidating some points in Spinoza's system, and interesting as showing what an encyclopædic mind he had. We shall look forward with keen anticipation to Professor Wolf's edition of the 'Ethica.'

POLITICS AND THE NEW ENGLAND CLERGY.

That the New England clergy—outside the Episcopal Church—played an important part in the Revolution and War of Independence is known to the general reader of British history. How important that part was both in the furnishing of solid principles of liberty and in the way of inspiration, Miss Alice M. Baldwin demonstrates in *The New England Clergy and the American Revolution* (Cambridge University Press; 17s. 6d. net). Dr. Baldwin writes with an hereditary interest in her theme, for she is the daughter of a congregational minister and has imbibed with her upbringing the spiritual background which gives her special insight into her subject. The book is fully documented by quotations and by references to the sermons and religious addresses of the period, and is an

example of careful, thorough work, well meriting the doctor's degree, for which it formed the thesis.

Taking for granted the right of the colonists to resist laws and imposts which they resented as unjust, she proves that to the clergy is due in large measure the credit of enlightening the general public and of making resistance an act of reason and religion. They were not to begin with revolutionaries—the Hanoverian dynasty was deeply cherished—but when the King of England, as they thought, degenerated to the policy of the Stuarts, they were forced by their principles to resist as Cromwell had resisted.

Their insistence on the rights of liberty of person and property was not immediately derived from the doctrinaire theories of France, but was an inevitable inference from their religion, and was buttressed by religious sanctions and moved by religious zeal. As they understood religion it was not a subjective pietism but a moral and political force. It claimed all life as its province. Nor did they adopt these views *ad hoc* without previous thought; they had reasoned them out in theory and applied them in practice in their parishes in the smaller sphere of parochial life before the necessity arose of applying them to their relation to England, and thus when liberation was won they were in a position to frame constitutions and laws based on eternal principles of justice, and they safeguarded liberty from degenerating into licence.

All this is abundantly proved in this careful volume, and it throws light on a chapter of Church history as well as on a political crisis. Dr. Baldwin's work is deserving of all praise both as to its fairness and competency, and we congratulate her on her success.

Many of us have thought that the conflict between science and religion was ended. Recently, however, Dean Inge and others have sounded a warning note to the contrary. And so any reassuring note on this matter is welcome. Such a note is struck in a handsome book, sent out by the Abingdon Press, New York, which is doing a great deal for the cause of religion at present. It is called *Christianity in Science*, and is by Mr. Frederick D. Leete ($3.00). The name only partly indicates the scope of the work, for the writer's object is to show that Christianity and science, so far from being antagonistic, are really friendly and helpful to one another. For one thing, he demonstrates that science has in various ways contributed to the welfare of religion. Again, he points out that religion (and especially the Christian religion) has been behind many of the advances of science. And finally, he emphasizes the religious nature of the leaders in science themselves. The whole essay is characterized by two qualities, its optimism and its practical method. The argument is not conducted on a level of over-strenuous thinking, but the writer has read widely; within his own limits he knows the field thoroughly; and he has written a book that will be read by religious people and (let us hope) scientific workers with pleasure and profit.

Some time ago Mr. Arthur Ransome was sent out by 'The Manchester Guardian' to report on the situation in China when the trouble in Hankow was at its height. He has set down his impressions in *The Chinese Puzzle* (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net). So swiftly do things move in China that a book like this begins to be out of date before it can be issued from the press. At the time these pages were written Eugene Chen and Borodin were still in power, Chiang Kai-chek had gone into exile, and the split between the Communists and the Nationalist Party had not taken place. Yet Mr. Ransome has much of value to tell us, much that we need to know if we are to have a fair view of the Chinese question. He has been at pains to collect and give expression to Chinese opinion, as well as to the opinion of the foreign community in Shanghai. Best of all, perhaps, he has succeeded in showing how vast and intricate the Chinese puzzle is, and how presumptuous it would be for any of us to forecast with confidence the final solution of it.

An excellent monograph on the life of Paul for higher Bible Classes and Student Study Circles has now appeared in a revised edition with a new chapter on the theology of Paul—*The Life of Paul*, by Professor B. W. Robinson, Ph.D. (Cambridge University Press; 10s. net). There is no bewildering expatiation on disputable points, no footnotes or obscure references, but solid direction to authoritative and accessible literature at the end of each chapter and in a valuable bibliographical appendix.

There is abundant evidence on every page of faithful and honest study of the original sources—also a truly helpful setting of the Apostle's life and work in the world milieu of his age, a real appreciation of the worth and influence of St. Paul, and much to illumine the language and thought of the New Testament—as, for example, the fixation of the date of Gallio's proconsulship, the light shed by

papyri and ostraka on the language, so that the student can find here a safe starting-point and faithful guide for beginning and continuing his study of the life and labours of the great Apostle.

We heartily recommend this book to those for whom it was primarily written.

Scots Theology in the Eighteenth Century, by the Rev. Professor Alexander McNair, M.A. (James Clarke ; 6s. net), is a book which does not altogether answer to the expectations raised by its title. Instead of being, as one would expect, a survey of eighteenth-century theology in Scotland, the book is in reality a monograph dealing with the case of Dr. McGill, whose views on the Atonement caused a certain stir in the Scottish Church towards the end of the century. The general reader will be apt to feel that it is scarcely worth while, at this time of day, to rehearse again so fully the details of the case. It must be said, however, that Professor McNair has done his work with great care and thoroughness, while in the concluding chapters he deals with certain aspects of the Atonement in a scholarly and helpful way.

Enter China, by Mr. George G. Barnes (Edinburgh House Press ; 2s. net), is 'a study in race contacts.' The writer is of opinion that 'nations are being drawn ever closer together in a shrinking world, with the door locked. They must adjust themselves to one another, or perish from sheer exasperation.' His aim is to give us a sympathetic insight into the Chinese mind, and at the same time to show us ourselves as seen through Chinese eyes. In this he has achieved real success. The book is a series of impressionist sketches which bring the Chinese world before the reader's mind with uncommon vividness. In the closing chapter the thesis is maintained that the only solution of the race problem is the inclusion of all nations in the family of God.

Chinese Realities, by Mr. John Foster (Edinburgh House Press ; 2s. 6d. net), is one of the sanest and most illuminating accounts of the Chinese Revolution that have yet appeared. The writer is a missionary who has lived for years in China, has observed closely and pondered deeply the significance of the changes that have passed before his eyes. He writes with remarkable fairness and balance of judgment. He shows that the Revolution is no mere question of foreign aggression, or of labour conditions in foreign mills, but something far more profound. The anti-Christian agitation is really anti-imperialist and anti-capitalist, and, most sinister of all, anti-religious. For young China has cast its native idols to the moles and to the bats, and is preaching materialism in the name of science. 'The fact is that for young China the old religions are down and dead and done with ; the only religion which to-day is sufficiently alive to make a bid for the soul of young China is Christianity ; in a word, if young China does not become Christian, young China will very soon have no religion at all. These are tidings, not to lift us into the seventh heaven, but to weigh us trembling to our knees.'

The British Broadcasting Corporation having conceived the idea that, instead of separate disconnected Sunday addresses, they might try the experiment of a short course of sermons having as their main object to restate for the ordinary listener-in the fundamental beliefs of the Christian Faith, the Bishop of Winchester was asked to write a book to accompany these addresses. The result is given under the title *What is God like?* (Hodder & Stoughton ; 1s. net). It is, as it ought to be, simple, popular, and persuasive. After commenting on man's thirst for God, and indicating certain signposts which point the way to the supreme reality, the writer leads up through the Old Testament prophets to Jesus as the final revelation and perfect image of God. He then deals with the difficulties to faith arising from the prevalence of physical and moral evil, and finally presses home the truth that 'the finding of God is the beginning of service.' It is a little book that will be widely read.

Dr. Vacher Burch, Lecturer in Theology, Liverpool Cathedral and Cathedral School of Divinity, is writing diligently on Christian origins, and his recent work, *The Structure and Message of Saint John's Gospel* (Martin Hopkinson ; 10s. 6d. net), will enhance his reputation for learning, scholarship, and critical acumen. It is, however, a pity that his style, while pointed and pithy, may yet be at the same time so vague, allusive, and subtle that it is difficult now and again to catch the true drift of his meaning. The ordinary thoughtful reader will pause at places in bewilderment, and the expert reader (who alone, after all, can fully appreciate such a book as this) will be too apt to dismiss it in impatience. The book is hardly a 'new commentary' on the Fourth Gospel, but it traverses the body of the Gospel, and seeks to throw fresh light, derived largely from the study of the

Hellenistic background of the New Testament, on the problems of its structure, character, and date.

The writers with whom Dr. Burch chiefly keeps company are a select band of modern critical scholars, English, American, and Continental; and, in face of them, he would vindicate the historicity of Jesus Christ and of the Gospel which is a *Vita Christi*. In particular he examines the recent claim that much in the Gospel has been taken from the Mandæan literature (Iranian Gnosticism).

On the problem of the difference between the Synoptic *logion* and the Johannine *logion*, Dr. Burch is clear and emphatic. What has been so long ascribed to the Johannine point of view or to the influence of Greek philosophy ought to be put down to the work of the translator from Aramaic into Greek. We have not John's Gospel in Greek, but his Aramaic translated into Greek. And that Greek is much more Johannine than John's own, as may be seen from a comparison between the First Epistle and the Gospel. In the *logia* of Jesus, as preserved in the Fourth Gospel, we have to do not with John's philosophical remodelling of Jesus' teaching, but with John's original reporting plus the 'Johannist's' Greek. And Jesus can come to us directly through the 'Johannist's' Greek.

The Kingsgate Press send out two books by Baptist writers, both comforting to Baptists and Congregationalists, but also of great interest to others. One is *The Freedom of God*, by the Rev. H. Townsend, M.A., D.D., and contends not only that our thought of God is normative in our religion, but is actually determinative of our Church connexions. The religious bodies into which Christianity is broken up are really different and conflicting Christianities. And the writer goes so far as to say that the different definitions of Christianity are due to the fact that we do not believe in the same God. In particular the conceptions of religion, of sacraments, of Church and ministry held by Baptists are the working out in history of their belief in the Freedom of God. 'The truth is, that you cannot reconcile the Roman and the Anglo-Catholic doctrine of God with that of the Baptist. . . . Baptists and Anglo-Catholics do not believe in the same God.'

The other book is by Principal A. C. Underwood, B.Litt., D.D., of Rawdon College, and is on *The Continental Reformation*. In dealing with its development, principles, and results, the writer is, as may be expected, highly commendatory. The most interesting chapter is the one on 'Our Debt to the Reformation,' and sums up the contribution which the great movement has made to religious and social well-being. At a time when so many people are inclined to sniff at Luther and all his works, a robust and whole-hearted proclamation of his merits and influence is refreshing.

Both books are published at 2s. 6d. net.

The Triumph of Life (Longmans; 10s. 6d. net), by the Rt. Rev. Mgr. William Barry, D.D., Rector of St. Peter's, Leamington, consists of a series of chapters in letter form on the subject of 'Science and the Soul.' The style is clear and animated, and is enriched with many literary allusions, drawn in particular from the classics; and the author shows himself a practised debater. But the debate is conducted in a late-Victorian *milieu*, and the magnates with whom Dr. Barry deals faithfully, in accordance with the principles of the 'high master,' St. Thomas Aquinas, are such as Huxley, Spencer, and Tyndall. It is not that Dr. Barry is unacquainted with more recent writers in the particular sphere of psychology. His chapter on Sleep and Dreams, for example, is written in view of recent tendencies of thought. But although his book belongs in form to the last twelve years, in substance it is older, as witness this apparently unrevised sentence: 'Hume, and *in our day* Spencer, would fain ask how a consciousness which changes . . . can reveal that which does not change.' The manner and the spirit of Dr. Barry's book appears in such a typical passage as the following: 'We have seen how, in deference to that truth which has for them no eternal or absolute value, unbelieving men of science put aside all that gives our life more than a momentary value. Ideals to them are but imaginations, in Pindar's words, "the dream of a shade." History with its countless deeds of heroism—so George Eliot sang—was but "a scroll within a tomb, to be unread for ever." Thus would all the magnificent conquests of knowledge end in a negation, not without irony.' Somehow we feel that Dr. Barry does not appreciate the new-found attitude of many scientific theorists, with their sense of the limitations of natural science.

A book which deals both with theory and with practice in religious education, and especially with both these aspects of Sunday School work, is *An Introduction to Sunday School Work*, by Mr. C. F. Hunter, B.A. (Ludgate Circus House; 2s.). We can cordially commend this excellent manual. There are chapters on child nature, on Sunday School organization according to modern ideas, and finally on methods of teaching. Frankly, we

question the value of a good deal of the 'psychology' recently applied to the child and his treatment, and this in our opinion is the least valuable part of Mr. Hunter's work. But the chapters on the modern Sunday School as it should be, and particularly the valuable advice on the actual teaching of a lesson, are just what young teachers and inexperienced but open-minded superintendents need. If the last section on 'The Teacher and his Work' could be printed as a separate booklet and put into the hands of teachers everywhere it would greatly benefit the teaching in our Sunday Schools. And if the teacher finds that this only whets his appetite for more detailed guidance so much the better.

If any one is looking for a gift book for young people that is both handsome to look at and interesting to read, he will find it in the latest publication of the Religious Tract Society, *Feathered Friends of Field and Forest*, by Eleanor E. Helme (7s. 6d. net). The writer's aim is to tell her young readers all about the birds they may see when they go to the country. And so we have the magpie, the jay, the lapwing, the owl, the swift, and skylark, and rook, and finches, and others. You will hear all about their habits, their nests, their virtues, and peccadillos. And there are sixteen lovely full-page coloured plates, so that you cannot fail to recognize these little friends, besides black-and-white drawings, all by Barbara Briggs. The book is a treasure, fascinating in its letterpress and beautiful in its printing, its binding, and its adornments.

The Transforming Friendship, by the Rev. L. D. Weatherhead, M.A., F.R.G.S. (Sharp; 3s. 6d. net), is described in the sub-title as 'A Book about Jesus and Ourselves.' It consists of a dozen addresses on the Christian life conceived as a personal relation of friendship with Christ. It is freshly written, with real insight and a fine glow of religious feeling. The writer has a gift of imagination, and knows how to illuminate his pages with apt and telling illustrations. It is a book of unusual beauty, and one which is fitted to introduce the thoughtful reader to intimacy with the Divine Friend.

'The evolution theory is a potent weapon against all that is best and noblest in man.' That sentence sums up the message of *Evolution and War*, by Mr. Reginald Cock, M.R.C.S. (Elliot Stock; 3s. 6d. net). The theory is examined, and found wanting. And, if Mr. Cock is right, the outlook for a world that has accepted evolution is very bleak. Because the evolution theory 'teaches that nations are of different germ-plasm and cannot look upon one another as fellow creatures,' hence the inevitable certainty of war. The courage of a writer who takes up his broom to sweep back the tide of scientific theory is admirable. Let us hope his gloomy prognostications will not realize themselves.

The Rev. J. Vernon Bartlet, D.D., the well-known Mansfield College Professor, has done a most useful and acceptable service in editing a series of selections from the works of the late Gaston Frommel under the title *The Psychology of Christian Faith: Being Selections from the Writings of the late Gaston Frommel* (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net). The translations have been done by the Rev. J. Macartney Wilson, D.D. Dr. Bartlet has done the choosing, the revising, and the editing. The result is a book of quite unusual fascination. The editor gives us in an introductory essay a sketch of Frommel's career, and an estimate of his contribution to the psychology of religious experience. Then follow the selections, illustrating first Frommel's approach to religion, next his doctrine and faith, and finally his treatment of the Inner Life. At the forefront of parts one and two are sketches of Frommel's great teachers, Alexander Vinet and César Malan, by himself, essays very relevant to the rest of the book. The profound insight of this writing, the deep religious feeling, and the clear and strenuous thinking make these chapters as pleasant to read as they are religiously helpful. Perhaps the very best part of the book is its last section, on 'Communion with Jesus Christ'; it is a fine specimen of the blend of personal piety and masculine thinking, which is the peculiar attraction of the whole volume.

In *Sons of Africa* (S.C.M.; 5s. net), Miss G. A. Gollock has given us a picture gallery with portraits of unusual variety and interest. Her aim is to discover to us the wealth of character and intellectual capacity of the African race. We have here studies of great African chiefs from the dire Tshaka to Khama the Good. The romance of Bishop Crowther is thrillingly re-told, and studies are given of the career and achievements of such notable Christian statesmen and scholars as Sir Apolo Kagwa and Dr. Aggrey. A considerable number of slighter sketches are added of native evangelists and teachers, prophets, and men of affairs, while not the least interesting is a chapter on Mothers of Men. The whole is a convincing vindication of the claim that the African has his own contribution to make to the commonwealth of nations.

A Lost Verse in the Gospel of Mark.

By J. Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D., D.D., Birmingham.

It was in the last year that I had the happiness of recovering a missing verse or half-verse from the fourth chapter of the Gospel of John, a sentence which had disappeared from every existing copy of the sacred text, but which we were able to show to have once existed in the *Diatessaron of Tatian*, and which internal evidence showed to be the work of the Evangelist, and not the observation of an acute commentator. The missing sentence was the reply of Jesus to the inquiry of the Samaritan woman as to the source from which He derived the living water that He proposed to bestow upon a thirsty world. The discovery was published in The Expository Times for May 1927, and, if one may judge from communications which students of the Gospel made to the discoverer, there were not a few who shared in the happiness of the find and were glad of the enrichment which it gave to a chapter which was already heavily laden with deep thoughts, and a very argosy of spiritual truth.

I am now going to try to recover a missing verse from the Gospel of Mark; only my readers must be warned in advance that this time we have not the support of a single textual authority; and it is quite possible that some people will put the matter from them, and say that they do not want a Gospel which is conjured up out of non-existence by the magical spells of the imagination. Well, we are not writing for such; our appeal will only be made to those who think that the imagination as well as the reason and the power of observation may have a service in Biblical science.

In order to make clear the direction in which the aid of the imagination is to be invoked, we shall need some preliminary study.

The story of the trial, defence, and martyrdom of St. Stephen in the Acts of the Apostles, amongst whom Stephen may very properly be included as the very first missioner to the Hellenic world, and, in an indirect way, the founder of the Church at Antioch, is characterized by a singular parallelism between Stephen and his Master. Even a superficial reader recognizes that Stephen praying for his murderers is a companion portrait to the 'Father, forgive them' of Jesus Himself; and a superficial criticism, finding that the Lord's prayer for His enemies is wanting in certain copies of the Gospel of Luke, has hastily inferred that the text of the Gospel has been reinforced from the account of Stephen's prayer in the Acts. We do not stop to discuss the meaning of that particular parallel; we only refer to it as an isolated case of what occurs on a much wider scale. Indeed it becomes quite a common practice in the historians of the Early Church to observe, or even to accentuate, or possibly to invent, such cases and events as might serve to show that the experience of the Master was reproduced, even to detail, in the sufferings of the servants. Polycarp's martyrdom may serve as an illustration.

If we read the Martyrdom of Jesus as told by Mark over against the Martyrdom of Stephen, as told by Luke, we shall see that there is a literary dependence of the Acts upon Mark, over and above the general theory of an *Imitatio Christi* to which we have alluded.

For instance, Mark relates (14^{53}) that 'they brought Jesus to the high priest (*ἀπήγαγον . . . πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα*), and there came together all the high priests (*sic*: plural) and the elders and the scribes.' After a reference to the conduct of Peter, the account continues: 'Now the high priests (*sic*: plural) and all the Sanhedrin sought testimony against Jesus to kill him, and found none.' That is the way in which the judicial proceedings against Jesus commence: in the case of Stephen, we are told that

'They stirred up the people and all the elders and the scribes, and came upon him and brought him to the Sanhedrin (*ἤγαγον . . . εἰς τὸ συνέδριον*).' So far the accounts are parallel in structure, and show some coincidence in expression, over and above what may be described as inevitable.

We come next to the employment of false witnesses, and the nature of their testimony: the substance of it, in the case of Stephen, is that, 'We have heard him say that this Jesus the Nazarene shall destroy this place and change the customs which Moses delivered to us.' Ac 6^{14}: *ἀκηκόαμεν γὰρ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζωραῖος οὗτος καταλύσει τὸν τόπον τοῦτον κτέ*, with which we compare Mk 14^{58}: 'We have heard him saying, I will destroy this temple made with hands' (*ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ὅτι Ἐγὼ καταλύσω τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον τὸν χειροποίητον*). The two accounts have now drawn very close together, not only in the matter narrated, but in the manner of the narration.

Then we have the direct appeal of the high priest to each of the prisoners. In Mark it runs thus: 'The high priest rose in the midst (εἰς τὸ μέσον), and asked Jesus, saying, Have you nothing to answer?' In the Acts the narration is briefer, 'The high priest said, Are these things so?'

It will, I think, be conceded that Luke's account of the trial of Stephen has been affected, both structurally and linguistically, by the Markan account of the trial of Jesus.

We ought not to omit from these suggestions of parallelism the fundamental element of a charge of blasphemy, in which Jesus and Stephen use matters of personal testimony (prophecy and its fulfilment) which can hardly be independent. It may very well be the case that, when Jesus says that His judges shall see the Son of Man seated at the right hand of the Power and coming with the clouds of heaven, and when Stephen affirms that he fulfils the prediction in his own person by a vision of open heavens and of the Son of Man standing at the right hand of God, we have before us the historical motive for a highly-developed literary parallelism. The two narrations can hardly be independent. They are connected either in fact or intention. They could be printed on opposite pages with appropriate indications of type.

And now we come to the very interesting discovery upon which we have discoursed elsewhere, that the Western text of the Acts has inserted the words 'standing in the midst' at the junction of the sixth and seventh chapters of the Acts. As commonly understood, these words have been taken to refer to Stephen, whose radiant face was like that of an angel standing in their midst; but it was claimed by me, many years since, that they really belonged to the high priest, who rises to address the criminal, and that we should replace the gloss so as to read, 'And the high priest rose in the midst, and said.' I do not propose at this point to resume the discussion which was naturally provoked by this way of explaining the gloss. The point that I want to emphasize is this, that by attaching the words to the high priest we complete an already existing parallel between Luke's account in the Acts and the Markan Gospel. That is, certainly, very significant, and ought to be almost the last word in the discussion. I do not propose, at this point, to invade the whole area of the problem of the Western glosses. If our explanation is correct, we have amplified and completed the evidence for the dependence of the Acts upon Mark.

Now we come, after a lengthy prologue, to the question with which we are really occupied, over and above the ordinary questions as to the text of the Acts and its interpretation. If it be conceded that Stephen is either in actual history or in literary presentation the subject of an *Imitatio Christi*, what are we to say about the shining face by which he is most commonly remembered, at least in art and in letters? Tennyson, for instance, delineates him as follows:

> Looking upward, full of grace,
> He prayed, and from a happy place,
> God's glory smote him on the face.

Tennyson has carried forward the descent of the Divine glory upon the martyr from the trial to the martyrdom: for, in the Biblical account, the prayer comes later than the trial. Is it possible that there stood in the Markan original a statement with regard to the angelic face of Jesus Christ at His trial, similar to that which is recorded of Stephen? Nothing more likely, in view of the fact that the early Christian tradition lays stress on the glorious appearance of Christ's face. St. Paul, it will be remembered, has, in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, an actual allegory on the greater glory of the New Covenant when contrasted with the Old Covenant, the subject-matter of the allegory being the face of Jesus and the face of Moses. Christian experience, in this connexion, is defined as an 'illumination of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ' (2 Co 4^6); when considered as progressive, rather than as immediate, Christian experience is defined as a change from glory to glory by beholding or reflecting the glory of the Lord (2 Co 3^{18}); the whole passage with its parallelism between Moses' face and Christ's, shows that the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ was a natural, and perhaps a familiar theme. There may be other origins for the theme, as, for instance, the Transfiguration, to which reference seems to be made in the words, 'We are transfigured into the same image'; but even the reminiscence of Tabor recalls the Face that shone like the Sun, so that we can without much difficulty enter into the Apostolic mind and look at history with St. Paul's eyes.

This, then, is our suggestion, that in the original text of Mark (or Markan origins, if we cannot be satisfied with a single 'honest ghost' for an Evangelist), there stood a statement to the effect that 'all in the council, looking upon Jesus, saw his face like the face of an angel.' The text of Mark might then have something as follows, if we wish to justify the Western text of the Acts:

> οὐδὲ καὶ οὕτως
> ἴση ἦν ἡ μαρτυρία αὐτῶν·

[καὶ εἶδον τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ
ὡς πρόσωπον ἀγγέλου
ἑστῶτος ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν·]
καὶ ἀναστὰς ὁ ἀρχιερεύς
εἰς τὸ μέσον [αὐτῶν]
ἐπηρώτησε τὸν Ἰησοῦν, λέγων·

The advantage of this arrangement is that by the repetition of the line-endings, the error of omission can be explained. I should, however, prefer to omit the fifth line, and to explain the 'standing in the midst' as I have done formerly. All that I am arguing for is that a significant passage has been lost in the Gospel of Mark, of which there is a reminiscence in the Acts of the Apostles.

Was St. Paul a Stammerer?

By the Reverend W. K. Lowther Clarke, D.D., London.

A new discussion of St. Paul's 'thorn in the flesh' can only be justified if new material is presented for consideration. Thus Dr. Richardson's suggestion,[1] that the Apostle was literally crucified, at least as far as the beginning of the ordeal, though hardly likely to win acceptance, must have been read by many with interest. There is room for speculation because no theory holds the field.

1. Sir William Ramsay's idea that Paul was attacked by malaria at Perga and went for his health's sake to the highlands has little in its favour. He was a native of Tarsus, and must have known other methods of treating fever than that of plunging into the heart of the bandit-infested mountains; and how would a convalescent from malaria be 'a temptation in the flesh' to the Galatians (Gal 4^{14})?

2. Epilepsy has been surmised from the 'spat out' of Gal 4^{14} (R.V. marg.), which is said to refer to the custom of spitting to avert a demonic attack. The Galatians did not do what might have been anticipated. But there is no need to insist on the literal sense, and, even if it is allowed to stand, other inflictions besides epilepsy were ascribed to demons.

3. Ophthalmia is unlikely, in view of the keen glances of the Apostle frequently referred to.

4. Skin trouble, such as erysipelas, would certainly have been unsightly, but otherwise does not fit the evidence particularly well.

5. The earliest tradition, given by Tertullian, is headache. This, again, does not explain Gal 4^{14}, but I believe it puts us on the right track.

I suggest that St. Paul was a victim to nerves, and that modern men are peculiarly fitted to enter into his experience. Splitting headaches may well have accompanied the attacks, and they could hardly be described more appropriately than by the word *σκόλοψ*, a stake driven into his head. Read 2 Corinthians and you see at once that the writer was a mass of nerves, acutely sensitive and a prey to melancholy and depression which came as the ebb-tide of the mighty incoming tide of exaltation which was the other side of his being. Such was his essential sanity that a cure would probably have been possible if he could have enjoyed a quiet life and sympathetic companionship. But that was always out of his reach. His body was shattered by the experiences described in 2 Co 11, 'the care of all the churches' was a terrible mental strain, and the psychic and spiritual side of his life made great demands on his weakened frame. Once his nerves began to go, the conditions of recovery were absent.

But some outward manifestation must be sought, such as at times limited his appeal severely. I suggest that, at least at times of exceptional strain, he suffered from inability to express himself clearly, partial aphasia, or, to use one word, a stammer. To test this, let us look at Lightfoot's list of conditions which any theory must satisfy (*Commentary on Galatians*, 186 ff.).

1. Physical pain of a very acute kind.

2. The malady was very humiliating, a set-off against his spiritual privileges and a check to his spiritual pride.

3. It was a grievous hindrance to the gospel and a powerful testimony to it when overcome.

4. The affliction seems to have attacked him when he preached, exposing him to possible contempt.

5. The meanness of his personal appearance may be connected with it.

6. The trouble was recurring.

Of these factors, all except five are admirably satisfied by the combination of headache and

[1] In the January number of *Theology*.

stammering as accompaniments of shattered nerves.

It is time to look at the passages.

(*a*) Gal 4^{13-15}: 'Ye know that because of an infirmity of the flesh (δι' ἀσθένειαν τῆς σαρκός) I preached the gospel unto you the first time: and that which was a temptation to you in my flesh ye despised not, nor rejected; but ye received me as an angel of God . . . ye would have plucked out your eyes and given them to me' (R.V.). 'Because of an infirmity' seems to support Ramsay's theory. But we cannot now insist on the classical use of διά with the accusative, as Lightfoot did. Ro 3^{25} 8^{20} are clear examples of the accusative used for the correct genitive, which is corroborated by non-literary evidence. The Greek Fathers are right in taking the phrase as meaning 'in (or with) an infirmity of the flesh.' The preaching was hindered by the Apostle's affliction. What can hinder a sermon more than a stammer? But the hearers rejected the temptation to despise the speaker. They received him with sympathy and would have done anything for him.

(*b*) 2 Co 12 gives fuller information. The affliction began at a definite period, fourteen years ago. St. Paul had a supreme mystic experience, which he was unable to describe. 'It is not *lawful* for a man to utter' it, he says, but the words are at least consistent with the supposition that a temporary aphasia made it impossible to describe his experience. And just then came the thorn in the flesh, 'a messenger of Satan to buffet me.' Now anything which prevented the proclamation of the gospel could be called 'a messenger of Satan' (cf. 1 Th 2^{18}), and stammering suits these particular words better than anything which has been suggested so far. After all, there is a mystery about St. Paul's preaching. Reading the Acts, *e.g.* the Areopagus speech, we imagine it must have been extraordinarily effective. But in 2 Co 10^{10} we read that the verdict was, 'His letters are weighty and strong; but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech is contemptible' (ἐξουθενήμενος; cf. Gal 4^{14}, 'the temptation that beset you in my flesh you did not contemn,' ἐξουθενήσατε). And in 2 Co 11^{6}, 'though I be rude in speech' (ἰδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ). This is generally explained by saying that St. Paul was deficient in the art of rhetoric. But the Epistles, parts of which have been recently shown to conform to the rules of 'ancient artistic prose,' do not suggest this any more than the Acts, and perhaps the Church of Corinth, with its 'not many mighty, not many noble,' would not have been very particular about the technical excellence of sermons. But a voluble Greek community would have found a preacher's stammer a stern obstacle to the acceptance of his message.

An objection must be met here. In Ac 14^{12} Paul 'was the chief speaker,' and elsewhere in the book his preaching seems to have been effective. But it is a peculiarity of stammering that the sufferer is never quite sure of himself. Sometimes he is at the top of his form and pulls off a brilliant success. The very effort he has to make to speak well produces good results on the happy occasions when inhibitions are removed. Above all, he is largely dependent on a sympathetic audience. The enthusiastic welcome at Lystra may have helped him to make one of the most effective speeches of his life, though the leader of a deputation who is 'the chief speaker' is not always a good speaker. Conditions would have been different at Athens. This 'University Sermon' may have been most trying. Does St. Luke preserve the notes of a speech for which the Apostle made a great effort but failed ignominiously? Athens was the last place to tolerate a breakdown.

We are getting very speculative here, but it is worth continuing the line of thought. Paul went on to Corinth 'in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling,' no longer relying on 'excellency of word.' This exactly describes the state of mind of a stammerer after failing to make his message effective, and it is precisely at Corinth, after this set-back, that we get evidence of his 'contemptible speech.' There is a passage in Colossians ($4^{2.3}$) which may be taken to hint at a recurrence of the old nervous fears. 'Praying for us, that God may open for us a door for the word . . . that I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak.'

Lastly, let us remember that stammerers sometimes write very well. The brilliant orator feels no need to polish his sentences with great care; they come rolling off his tongue with too much ease. But the tongue-tied man, conscious that he has a message, the effectiveness of which is hindered by his limitations, takes endless trouble to express himself well on paper. Charles Lamb, Charles Kingsley, and 'Lewis Carroll' are examples of stammerers who made their mark in literature. Possibly the supreme power of St. Paul's Epistles owes something to the pains taken by a tongue-tied man to say properly on paper what he had failed to say effectively in speech. We can be quite sure that 1 Co 13 is a deliberate composition, polished and pruned until it became a masterpiece. If we omit it we can read 12^{31} 14^{1} consecutively—'a still more excellent way show I unto you,

Follow after love.' Having written this, St. Paul reflected that here was the place to interpolate his prose hymn in praise of Love. This is evidence for careful writing.

Nerves—headaches—stammering. Such is the complex which I imagine to have been St. Paul's 'thorn in the flesh.' If the stammering is thought fanciful, I would at least plead for the nerves, and suggest that the extraordinary appeal of the Apostle to many is due in part to the closeness with which he approaches twentieth-century civilized man in this respect. Or the headaches may be omitted. 'The thorn in the flesh' may be metaphorical, like the buffeting inflicted by the messenger of Satan.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Long Way Round is the Short Way Home.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

'God led them not by the way of the land of the Philistines, although that was near; . . . but God led the people about, by the way of the wilderness.'—Ex $13^{17f.}$ (R.V.).

It is an Italian proverb which says, 'The long way round is the short way home,' and it is truer than most proverbs, very true for all the world, and for your life and mine.

We live in a world that is in a dreadful hurry to-day. We want to go faster and faster. People that get things done quickly are admired. The short cut to anything is felt to be the best road; the near way is the best way.

The papers are full of advertisements of quick methods; how to make hair grow quickly, how to learn the piano in a month without scales or exercises, how to get rich quickly, and so on. Quickness is everything, and we are as sure as Euclid was that 'the shortest distance between two points is a straight line.' But that is only true on paper and in geometry; it isn't true for life. It isn't true on the surface of the earth, for the surface of the earth is not flat, but curved. The shortest distance between Liverpool and New York is a straight line on a map, but it isn't a straight line on the sea: it's a bit of a 'great circle.' On the map it seems round about and long, but the sailor knows that on the ocean 'the long way round is the short way home.'

I remember once going as a boy to climb Ben Lawers with an old minister and his sons. My idea was to go straight at it. There was the summit and the shortest way must be the best. When he led us by a way which started circling away round the mountain I thought he was a foolish old man. But when at last I was at the top and looked down at the road I would have chosen, I saw that he was right and I was wrong. My way would have been far harder and would have taken far longer; his way was easier and in the end quicker. It was the long way round, and it was the shortest way to the top.

I go back to the Bible and I find God doing just this thing. He was leading His people to a land of Promise. There was a 'near way,' 'the way of the Philistines,' and there was a long way, 'the way of the desert'; and it was the long way by which God led them. Why? Because He wanted them to be fit to enter the land of Promise. He was leading them not only from Egypt to Canaan, but from the feebleness of slaves to manhood and courage and self-confidence. It is easy to go quickly to Canaan, but it is not easy to get to the kingdom of character, and it cannot be done quickly. So because they needed the desert to make them into men fit to have a country of their own, 'God led them not by the way of the Philistines, though that was near, but he led them by the way of the wilderness.'

In the New Testament I find our Saviour tempted in the wilderness, and each temptation was the temptation of the near way, the short cut.

What was to be His way to His Kingdom in men's hearts? Bribe them with food, master them with force, dazzle them with miracles—these were the easiest ways, and Jesus would have none of them. He knew that no kingdom could stand long that was built that way, and so He chose the long, slow way of winning their hearts by love and their wills by persuasion and their minds by truth. It was the long way round. It took Him into the wilderness. It took Him to the Cross, but it was the only way. Once again the long way round was the short way home.

Girls and boys, don't let yourselves be cheated

by short cuts. In some things there are no short cuts.

At school in algebra and arithmetic the short cut is to turn up the answer without working it out. In Latin it is to get a crib instead of using your dictionary and your brain, or to get some one to do it for you. It saves time; but it saves time at the cost of everything else you ought to spend time to get. For it is not the answer that is the great matter, but the discipline of doing the work. As well expect to get strong by somebody else doing your gymnastics. As well expect to get good from a dinner which somebody else has eaten for you. You are being led into the kingdom of knowledge, the mind's land of promise, and the long way of honest work is in the end the short way home.

It is the same in the world of life. Our Father is guiding us up the heights of character. He leads by the way that is best—though it seems round about. He is leading us to a land of Promise, and He leads us by ways where discipline and effort will make us fit to arrive at that land of Promise, strong upright souls, fit to enter in and possess the land. He leads us by desert places, stony with temptation and disappointments, and sore with sorrows, because these things have a service to our souls. Souls cannot be made in a hurry. Character cannot be created by a magic wand. We would like to choose our paths and we should choose a path—a 'near way'—without these things.

But we are not allowed to choose our path; the only thing we can choose is our Companion. If we choose God for our Companion, it doesn't matter where He leads us, for we can say, as Jesus said, 'My Father is always with me.' Any road is long without a companion, and good roads are horrid with the wrong companion. With the right companion, the longest road is short; and we may be sure of this—that the long round with God is the short way home.

About writing Letters.

By the Reverend William J. May, Ilkeston.

'The salutation of me Paul with mine own hand.'—Col 4^{18}.

Once upon a time, nearly seven thousand years ago, before the days when Abram left Ur of the Chaldees to try to find a living God, there was a man named Annini, living at a place called Simta-Ha. He had a field, and one day he wrote a letter about it. He wrote it with an iron pencil on a slab of wet clay. When it was dry he put it in a clay envelope and sent it to his landlord. You could not tear up the letter written on a brick nor could you burn it very well. So after it was finished with the landlord threw Annini's letter away, envelope and all, and the desert sand drifted up and buried it. It buried Annini and his field as well, but a little while ago some one dug the letter up, and now you may see it in a London museum; the oldest letter in the world.

What kind of letters do you write? Some people write wonderful letters, letters so full of news and little word pictures of other places and other people that, long after the people who wrote them and the people who received them are dead, other people delight to read them because they are so interesting. You have to be very clever to write such letters as these. Perhaps your letters are very short and not very clever:

'Dear Father,—I hope you are all right. We had a topping game of footer on Saturday and beat the Lower House by two goals to one. My pocket-money is all gone.—Your loving son, David.'

And if anyone complains you declare that there was nothing else to write about last week. In the days when Moses went to school in Egypt, boys were writing letters home like that on pieces of papyrus.

Some day you will find more to write about, and I wonder what sort of letters you will write then. Every time you write a letter you tell people something about yourself. Your handwriting tells them something, and people can see whether you are careless or careful; whether you are proud or modest, whether you are strong and determined or weak and wavering. In your letters there are all sorts of things written in invisible ink, written between the lines, and people read them and see what you are. You did not intend to write those things down, they wrote themselves. Sometimes books are written about people and called, for example, 'St. Paul as Revealed in his Letters.'

Paul's eyes were very bad and he could not see very well, and perhaps his fingers were stiff, too, with working at his tent-making, so that he usually got some one to be his secretary. Sometimes Timothy would do it for him, and sometimes Luke would write, and sometimes a friend named Tertius wrote at Paul's dictation. When the letter was finished Paul would take the pen and sign it. I think the writing must have been bad and Paul felt a bit ashamed because it was so poor, so he added at the end of one of his letters; 'The greeting of me, Paul, with my own hand. Remember, I am in prison.' Another day his eyes were worse than usual, he could scarcely see, but he felt he

wanted to put down something himself, just as Baby does when Daddy is away. They came over to the window, and Paul took the reed pen from the other and began to write. Oh, but the letters were clumsy and sprawling. Paul nearly laughed at them. Then he wrote: 'See what big letters I make, when I write you in my own hand!'

In another place Paul says something still more interesting. He says to his friends, 'You are our letters; the letters everybody reads.' That sounds very curious. What does Paul mean? He means that, when other people in Rome and Ephesus and Corinth look at the people to whom Paul is writing, the people who call themselves Christians and say they love Jesus, they read in them the message Paul would like to write. I wonder if any one sees in you not just a message from Paul but a letter from Jesus. If Jesus wrote a letter what would He say? This, I think: 'A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you.'

Will you let Jesus write that upon your life and be His beautiful letter to the world?

The Christian Year.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Follow Me.

'Follow me.'—Mt 4^{19}.

Nothing gives a greater sense of the power of our Lord than the transformation He wrought in the character of His first disciples. He passed by the rich, the educated, the leaders of religion, and deliberately called Galilean peasants and fishermen. Their minds were filled with national and religious prejudices. They regarded the Kingdom of God as a political institution, based on the subjugation of the Gentile nations. We find in them ambition, envy, worldliness, jealousy, boasting, cowardice. They were not worse than others, but their mental and moral state was not very high when Christ said to them, 'Follow me.' In the course of a few years an extraordinary change passed over these men. We have the writings of some of them, and these have been reverenced for their truth and wisdom by generations of the wisest and best men who have lived. Further, those uneducated men are among the great forces that have turned the world into a diviner course.

And it is the same spiritual transformation Christ works in all who follow Him in every age. The first sign of change in the Twelve was an outward and visible one: they obeyed Christ literally—gave up their work, boats and nets, home and kindred, and became wanderers through the land with their Master. Now, is that sacrifice asked of us? It may be. But the root of the matter is this: that anything even in our outward life that hinders us from following Christ must be given up. If even things right in themselves had to be given up by those first disciples, much more must things that are not right. And as we look round the mere externals of our life, do we not find many things that hold us back from following Christ, or at least following Him fully—habits of physical ease and luxury, customs of the world and business which cannot stand His scrutiny, companionships and ties which hold us back from our own best ideals? And therefore when Christ calls us, as He called Peter and the rest, our first duty may be to make a change even in our outward life—to measure all by a new standard.

These outward things can be abandoned in a moment of time. Peter and John gave up their boats and homes at once. But did they follow Christ in spirit as quickly as in body? Far from it. Christ found it far easier to get them to forsake their homes than to abandon pride, ambition, greed, jealousy, intolerance, cowardice. For to follow Christ is much more than a change in the external life. It is a change in the very habits of the soul. It is the growth of Divine tempers and dispositions of the heart. And just this is the change which we see going on in the disciples by the mere process of following this strange Master of theirs. At the beginning their souls were full of ambition. And out of this worldly pride sprang those jealous quarrels for the highest places, the sound of which is heard all through the Gospels. At every turn the disciples misunderstood their Master's aims. It almost seems as if they were His followers in body alone. Yet look at these men a few years later—listen to their sermons, read their letters, watch the life they live. The old worldly idea of the Kingdom is gone: it is now a spiritual Kingdom of truth and love. It is no longer for Jews alone: its gates stand open to every nation. The old ambition for the chief places is dead: they are 'clothed in humility'; the cowardice which forsook Christ and fled is gone: they face governors and kings for His sake. The Cross, once a stumbling-block and foolishness, is now their glory.

Further, the *minds* of these men underwent an almost incredible development. When Christ found them their minds were filled with the current national ideas of God and man, the world, sin, righteousness. At first His thoughts on all these

were too great for them to receive with ease. But they followed Him, and in a few years we find these men moving familiarly in a world of marvellous ideas—ideas so great that the highest minds since have not fathomed their significance. They began with the belief that their Master was human in precisely the same sense as themselves—wiser, indeed, stronger, but still a mere man. But as they followed Him, they began to feel themselves in the presence of something far above them—something that forced on their minds the strange, inevitable conviction of Divinity. And with this conviction came a host of new and infinite thoughts: a Divine Incarnation—a God who bears the sins and sorrows of a world—an atonement of love—the unity of the human race in sin and salvation.

Or turn to another change, the *social* change, the new attitude in which He placed these men toward their fellows. When He called them they were imprisoned in the common national conception of the human race. The Kingdom of Heaven was theirs by right Divine; the Gentiles were only worthy to be their slaves. In this exclusive Heaven these ambitious fishers looked to receive the first places, and doubtless to raise their own kindred to the rank of their own dignities. But Christ lifted them out of this pit of selfishness and taught them that the Kingdom of their Master was the heritage which His grace made free to the uttermost parts of the earth. Nay—a much more difficult thing—He poured into them His own great and generous spirit, His own enthusiasm for humanity; until they were ready to face all privations, persecutions, and dangers, in order to carry this good news to every nation under heaven. The change is almost inconceivable—men who began by quarrelling for the highest places now ambitious only to be the servants of all, giving up home and country for the sake of strangers and foreigners, glorifying in the Cross, once their stone of stumbling and rock of offence!

This was the great and beautiful change which Christ was able to make in His first disciples. Often perplexed, they still continued in His temptations, they still strove to set their wills in tune with His, following loyally when they could not understand. And thus, hour by hour, the great miracle was wrought. 'Follow me' is the secret of it all.[1]

Wilfred Grenfell says: If increasing experience gives increasing wisdom, as I try to write down what I think Christ asks of each individual to-day, it is to do the thing that pleases Him. To have courage to follow Him and leave intellectual faith to be won by experience—of long, hard, and expensive experience—but to be won in the good fight, as every worth while acquisition of man must be. The humility of modern Science is a greater marvel than even its wonderful achievements. Humility, not infallibility, is the note that the man of to-day responds to. Life is not a tragedy, it is a field of honour. What the Christ's teaching leads me to do for Him is the gauge I shall be judged by. It is unquestionably the gauge by which men appraise any claim to the title Christian. What Christ seems to be asking me for every time is not comprehension but apprehension, not belief but courage. His religion is not the mean emotion that seeks to save itself, but that ennobling one which in willingly laying down life for others finds its own salvation.

[1] J. S. Carroll, *The Motherhood of God*, 191.

SIXTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Word of God.

'The fear of the Lord is clean, enduring for ever.'—Ps 19[9].

These are bold words to apply to fear of all things in the world. For among the affections of the human mind none has engendered, whether within or without religion, tempers more base; nor is there any emotion less firm or more quickly thrown off by growing men.

The rites and tempers of a religion have generally been unclean in direct proportion to the degree of terror for the deity which the religion inspired. Superstition is nothing but the dominance of an ignorant fear over reason and love; and superstition, as we know even within Christianity, has begotten every form of uncleanness and cruelty. On the other hand, it requires little observation or analysis to show that, while there is thus a fear which is false and perishable, there is another which is true, inevitable, salutary, and enduring. It would seem as if the writer of our psalm had such a distinction in his mind. Certainly he enjoyed the opportunity of observing it in view of the heathen religions by which his people were surrounded. These were rank with fear and with the unclean tempers that fear begets. In opposition to these the Psalmist boldly says: 'The fear of the Lord'—the God of Israel—'is clean, and enduring for ever.'

Now the Psalmist makes this claim for his religion in a psalm which sings the praise of the written forms in which that religion is enforced. The law of the Lord is perfect, the testimonies of the Lord are sure, the statutes of the Lord are right, the

commandment of the Lord is pure, the judgments or ordinances of the Lord are true. All these are well-known names for the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and especially for the body of sacred Law which they contain. When among the five terms, each clearly significant of the Scriptures, the Psalmist introduces the abstract expression 'the fear of the Lord,' he must mean something much the same: the Revealed Word of God—but rather in its general character and influence than in its separate precepts and laws. He must mean the awe, the obedience, the discipline and inspiration of the Book whose praise is the burden of his song.

Let us consider the unique authority which is here claimed for the Bible. Do not let us condemn the Old Testament for practices and tempers which its prophets themselves condemn. Let us rather measure the Bible by the unity of ethical purpose which it manifests from first to last, by the completeness with which it leaves behind every trace of a defective morality, and by the uncompromising and invincible opposition which the spirit of it offers to every political and religious interest that insinuates itself as a substitute for the ethical service of God.

Take, for example, those tempers and practices of early Israel which some men feel as difficulties in the way of their faith in the Bible. Are we not rather to see in the gradual disappearance of these from the pages of Scripture the illustration of the omnipotence of God's Spirit, the fulfilment of His claim who said: 'Behold, I make all things new'? Or take those later rites and doctrines of religion, which in their proper proportion and at certain historical crises may have been legitimate and necessary, but of which His prophets demanded the abolition when they were obtruded as substitutes for character and ethical service. For instance, when, in a period of great national prosperity, ritual and sacrifice were elaborated, and the nation laid the emphasis of their trust upon these, the prophets condemned all ritual, and insisted that justice, purity, and love were the only laws which God had given to men. 'What doth the Lord require of thee; but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?' Here is morality to the uttermost. When the nation, founding upon this absolute demand for righteousness and upon the promise of rewards by which it was accompanied, constructed the dogma that righteousness was always followed by prosperity, and that, conversely, suffering must be the proof of guilt, God inspired men to show that righteousness must be pursued for its own sake alone, apart from all rewards and in spite of adversity and pain. By Jeremiah and the author of the Book of Job, every literary acid—irony, satire, scepticism in its most bitter form—along with the more powerful solvents of the disappointments and adversities of life, are employed to eat out from the mind of Israel this dogma of the essential union of righteousness and prosperity; till we find left alone the faith that a good conscience is independent of every other aid; and that each experience of pain, of doubt, and of forsakenness which besets it is the means whereby it is brought to purer and more disinterested convictions of its duty and its strength. 'Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him.'

All this is even more evident in the New Testament. Throughout there is no aspiration after either political or ecclesiastical empire. Our aim, says the Apostle, is to present every man perfect in Christ Jesus.

Now as to the source of this morality, and the authority of it, we are left in no doubt. As our text says, it is the fear of the Lord: something personal in its source, authority, and means of enforcement. Nor is the fear mere submission before the unknown and inscrutable power of the Almighty. Still less is it obedience to any arbitrary decrees. It is much rather the reverence, the awe, and the impulse to imitation, which are stirred in a soul by the revelation of the character of God. The source and character of that morality being what they are, it follows that the means by which it is enforced throughout the Bible are not the instruments of mere force and wonder, but the declaration of the truth itself, the revelation of the Supreme Being in whose character and actions it is embodied, and the conviction that since it is His will and purpose, it cannot fail to be realized in the world.

But morality is more than education. We do not only grow from one ideal to another. We have to struggle. How vividly does the Bible represent this. From the Garden of Eden to the Garden of Gethsemane; from the temptation before the tree of knowledge to the temptations in the wilderness: with Adam and Abraham, with Jacob and Joseph, with Saul and David, with Solomon and Ahab and Gehazi, with Peter and Judas, with Paul and Demas—with one and all we see the same. They stand between two worlds and are conscript to their eternal warfare. A great sceptic has said that if anything could prove the Book to be the Word of God it is this way it has of aiding conscience

in opening our eyes to the two possibilities which lie before us and in bidding us make our choice for eternity. Here is fear in the noblest sense of the word: fear that is clean and enduring for ever. And if the Bible thus be at one with conscience in revealing the two worlds between which we stand, how thoroughly is it at one with experience in revealing to us ourselves—us who have to make that eternal choice. With a penetration and a truthfulness, attempted by no other book, it uncovers the secrets of the human heart.

But the Bible goes further than these obvious elements of morality. It tells us that the effort, the agony, nay, the very shame and curse of man's moral warfare are shared and borne by God Himself. The Story of this Divine Passion, which means both our condemnation, who have made it necessary by our sins, and our salvation, if we feel the penitence which it inspires as nothing else can, is found in these pages and in these alone. Hence their Divine validity. Not their inerrancy; not that they answer to this or that theory of inspiration; but that independent of all theories they tell to men the one Passion, the one Victory in all the history of time which can never grow old, nor lose its indispensable force for the sinful hearts of God's children; 'clean and enduring for ever'; needing nothing, as love needs nothing, of external authority or argument, to prove itself to the heart that requires it.[1]

SEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Lame walk.

'The lame walk.'—Mt 11[5].

These words occur as part of the answer which our Lord sent back to John the Baptist. John was lying in prison. We can well believe that the brave man's heart was near to giving way. We conclude that so it was, from the question which he commissioned some of his disciples to put to Jesus. That question had to be a very direct one, one of those questions which admit of only the answer 'yes' or 'no.'

The Baptist had to learn that you cannot get an off-hand, ready answer to any of life's really great questions. The answer from God to the great inquiries is never an unmistakable 'yes' or 'no,' for that would destroy the soul, would interfere with our moral education. A 'yes' spoken once for all by God to life's ultimate questions would paralyse our souls with a too great confidence; and a 'no' would paralyse our souls with despair. God's answer is never an explicit 'yes' or 'no,' but only the secret pressure of His Spirit upon ours. The answer which Jesus sent back to the Baptist was of the same kind as God still sends back to all our questioning. 'Art thou he that should come, or look we for another?' 'Am I wrong in believing? Am I wrong in my estimate of Christ? And in that case, am I wrong everywhere?' And Christ's answer to him was, 'The lame walk.'

It was part of Christ's wonderful manner that He would not give Himself a name. It was His plan to be Himself, to become for man all that He could become, and leave it to those, who in every age have been drawn to Him by secret and indestructible affinities, to say what they have found Him to be.

Jesus, in using the words 'the lame walk,' is describing what in His view was and is the characteristic feature or result of His appearance and work in the world of mankind. Jesus Christ came into the world in order to break up the tyranny of all natural and moral consequences. He came in order so to deal with us that we one by one should have a new beginning. He came in order to plant Something or Someone at the very root of our being, who should make all the difference in the world.

It is perfectly true that the Christian religion assumes what in theology is called the doctrine of the Fall of Man. It assumes that in some profound way the race of mankind has gone wrong. For practical purposes it declares also there is something in each one of us which needs to be put right. This is no disparagement of man. It is a disparagement of everybody in particular, but it is not a disparagement of man, the child of God. On the contrary, the doctrine of the Fall is the doctrine of the essential dignity and erectness of man.

To take an illustration which at the same time will lead us to the very text. Suppose I am walking behind some one whom I know, and presently I overtake him. I say, 'I am glad to see you, and glad to see how briskly you can go along.' Whereupon he looks at me displeased, and says: 'Surely you cannot mean it. As a matter of fact I am going lame just now!' Why is the man displeased? It is because I said something which meant that I thought he could walk no faster than he was walking; and his displeasure is just the fine protest of a man against being judged by his mere appearance, as though he could be nothing more.

Let us keep hold of this idea of lameness as signifying, of course, that condition of moral

[1] G. A. Smith, *The Forgiveness of Sins*, 26.

impotence, of weakness and stumbling, or of dullness and deadness to God which is our average and natural condition until Christ makes us different.

1. There are those who are *born lame*. We have become aware in our day as never before of how the generations are bound to one another, how the sins of the fathers may be visited upon the children. Though it is only of recent years that we have learned so much of the material processes of heredity, the thing itself has always formed part of the knowledge of the human race. The Bible knows the doctrine that because 'the fathers have eaten sour grapes, the children's teeth are set on edge.' But the Bible declares that what God is working for in this world is to overthrow that fatal sequence. God is working for a state of things, as Jeremiah says, when every one shall suffer for his own sin, and not for the sin of his fathers. And we believe that there is in Christ this very power to rescue every man from the dead hand of his ancestry. The great thinkers of Greece were engaged all the time with this very question—how was the evil which one generation had let loose in the world to be contradicted, transformed, brought to a standstill, and finally cast out? And it was given to them to see very deeply into that great inquiry. They saw, as in the *Antigone* of Sophocles, that if one of the fated line, even Antigone herself, were to allow that darkness to have all its way with her; if one were, in utter meekness and without one moment's revolt, to submit to the dark wave of evil consequence; that in her stricken soul the evil thing would die.

We verily believe that this has been done in Christ. Our fathers did well to protest that Christ had done something for the whole world of men, apart from what He could do for each of us, one by one. In dying as Christ died, there was impregnated into the world of mankind a new motive; there was let loose amongst the world-forces a new and blessed force—something which is now there, fighting against the tyranny of mere natural consequences; something which each hard-pressed soul of man can lay claim to as a power on his own behalf, and also as a reason for believing that He who is with him is more than all that is against him!

2. And there are those who are *lame as the result of an accident*. There are those who to-day are what they are, and not better than they are, because of a sin, or because of a sinful life. Every one who sincerely repents of his sin, who bemoans it, who puts it in spirit away from him, and puts himself humbly in Christ's hands to bear witness to Him in the world—every such one is forgiven, is back in the love of God.

3. Then, again, there are those who are lame *because they are weary*. They are getting older. Some of the visions of youth have failed. And in the case of many there have been sorrows, disappointments from children, or disappointments from themselves, which have the effect of bringing them to a standstill. The peril of our condition at such a time is that we consent to the view that, because in some ways this life has failed us, all has failed. There is the danger, too, at this stage, that we lose something of our first natural heroism and that we fall into a mood desiring mere physical comfort, and estimating life by what it gives rather than by what it suggests and keeps in reserve. And Christ heals us of this lameness, in part, by arousing our minds to what is really happening within ourselves. He came to show us that this world is not to be seen by itself, but always in its relation to another world and to God's will; that the things which are seen are temporal, and the things which are not seen are eternal.

4. There is yet another class of lame people in this world. They have become impaled upon a proverb: there are none so lame as those who will not walk. That is to say, there are those who are lame *because they are lazy*. How does Christ deal with these? These must present to Him the hardest case. For their malady is in the region of will; and even God cannot, certainly He will not, compel the will. And yet surely there is that in Christ which should shame us into protests against ourselves, when we consider that however we may sink back upon ourselves and humour ourselves in this world, there was One who heard in life a very different call.

Suppose we are standing on the bank of a river, when suddenly a child falls in and sinks. And we stand there doing nothing. But one of us steps out and plunges into the water to save the child. Suppose he saves the child. Do we not applaud his deed? Does not the most sluggish and worldly heart rise up to acknowledge an act like that which clothes our human nature with glory? And our applause, if it is genuine, is not mere applause. It is not mere admiration. It is the confession by every one of us who saw him do the deed that it was our deed; that in the deed he was our representative and substitute—not to spare us doing the like if the need should ever arise, but to create within hearts from which such an instinct is absent, and to augment in hearts where it already dwells, the instinct, in the presence of an occasion in which

the very reality of the world of the spirit is at stake, to fling away our dearest thing, even life itself.[1]

Eighth Sunday after Trinity.

Proceeding on the Positives.

'I believe; help thou mine unbelief.'—Mk 9^{24}.

'If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed.'—Mt 17^{20}.

Each of these utterances is contemplating faith in its smallness. In the first, its meagreness evokes an almost despairing cry. In the second, it evokes a confident prophecy. Yet the first has in it all the promise of the second. It is a prayer on its way to become a fulfilled prophecy. If any man say, 'Lord, I believe; help thou mine unbelief,' it makes all the difference possible whether his emphasis is on the first clause or the last.

The thing this man of the story put first was that he did believe. It was not much faith, but it *was* faith, and on it he ventured himself, though it was with a cry. Faith so small was his that, aware of it at one moment, he was unsure of it the next, yet since he knew it was there he put it first. Our unbelief, or our not-belief, may be of vastly greater magnitude than our belief, yet is our belief, be it ever so small and intermittent to our consciousness, of vastly greater significance.

There was a man whose eyes Jesus had opened, and who was fiercely cross-examined on the thing that happened to him. He was unable to give an entirely intelligible account of it. He could explain nothing, and he knew nothing even of the person who had healed him. But his mind worked positively before it worked interrogatively. It fastened on what he knew and refused to be drawn off. 'One thing I know.' It is well enough for us to get our doubts into the light and survey them with fearless eyes and a judging mind, but we can never do this wisely if we are at the same time ignoring our convictions. There is a negative perversity in most of us by which we are commonly more impressed by what we do not possess than by what we do, and are more persistent in brooding over the blessings we lack than we are in utilizing with thankfulness what we have. When Horace Bushnell was a college student, he completely lost his belief in God—not only in the God of the Christian revelation, but of even a vague theism. It was a time of profound mental distress for him, but he had to face what seemed a final fact. He surveyed what remained to him, and all that he could find surviving in himself out of his former convictions was an unshaken belief in 'the abstract principle of right.' He made up his mind to hold hard to this. He had no other god, and he tells that he actually knelt down and said his prayers to an abstract principle. He besought the Idea of Right to keep him true to Itself. He says it was a dreary prayer. But it was a true prayer, and it was the best he could do. Years afterwards he told this experience to his students, and went on to tell them, with a voice broken by emotion, how the God he had lost came back to him in his act of faith and commitment to the best that had remained to him in the hour of eclipse.

From the man who contemplated the smallness of faith through eyes clouded with misgiving, we turn to Jesus, who also, regarding faith at its smallest measure, saw in it an immense promise and potency. The saying is an example of our Lord's use of daring hyperbole. The least of all seeds grows into a tree so great that the birds build in its branches—a quite incredible thing for a mustard seed to do, but this is not a lesson in botany, but a symbol of the Kingdom, and the marvellousness of its huge growth out of so little is the very point of it. Between the seed and the tree there is absolute continuity, and one has become the other by the law of its own life.

Faith may be a little thing, meagre and embryonic, but if it be alive at all, it cannot stay where it is. It has more significance and potency in it than a whole mountain of negation. The smallest vital belief compels men to add to it everything that is kindred and cognate to its own quality. It is our Lord's appreciation of faith as an energy, of faith as an activity of the soul, which accounts for and justifies His forceful metaphor. 'Faith is the response of the organism which we name the soul to that environment which we call God.' It is more than a spirit of simple receptiveness. It is the primary motion of the human spirit when brought into contact with Divine truth and goodness. It was not the least contribution of St. Paul that, as Dean Inge has pointed out, he made a fight 'for the new content of the word Faith as a Christian virtue,' and the fight was for its new *active* meaning as a decisive act of moral trust, and for it as an energy, bound up as it is with other Christian virtues, and especially with Love. It is an energy which insists on 'possessing its possessions.' In the strength of one achievement it moves on to face the next challenge.

(1) There is a man of strong individuality and force of mind who feels that a whole mountain

[1] J. A. Hutton, in *If I had only One Sermon to Preach*, 239.

would have to be moved and cast into the deep before he could be brought to believe in God at all. He says this thing out of his own habit of thinking for himself, standing upon his own feet, living his own life. He has faith in himself. He believes in intelligence, in will and freedom, and these are the things that make personality. Let him hold to that. He will have to go further. Believing this, he must believe more. Is it possible that the Source of all things has given us something loftier than is in the Source? 'There are many errors,' says Sir Oliver Lodge, 'but there is one truth in anthropomorphism, whatever worthy attribute belongs to man, be it personality or any other, its existence in the universe is thereby admitted; we can deny it no more.'

(2) There is another man who toward God presents a mind of blank negation. But he is greatly alive to the wonder of the world; he seeks and finds deep satisfaction in the majesty, beauty, and wonder of Nature's processes and results. But this man may not stand where he is. These emotions are the answer of personality to the touch and charm of some external cause, and he owns them real and enriching. This is a faith.

Campanella, the monk of Calabria, near three centuries ago, uttered in rhyme the real challenge to this potential believer:

Deem you that only you have thought and sense,
While heaven and all its wonders, sun and earth,
Scorned in your dulness, lack intelligence?
Fool! What produced you? These things gave you birth;
So have they mind and God.

(3) There is another man, whose halt in faith is at a wholly different point. It is at Christ, as the final revelation of God and as in unique relation to both man and God, that he has stumbled. But if the meaning of Christ, in that full range which the Christian creed and devotion express, is to him still impossible, is all his mind a negation concerning Christ? There are some things about Christ he is able to assent to gladly. Let him hold to these. Christ lived a life of perfect goodness; believe then in that goodness. He lived and died in perfect love; believe then in that love. Let him stand to these things.

(4) There is yet another man, whose faith is only a smoulder amid a conscious moral confusion. Yet the doctrines and facts, if they be facts, of pardon, reconciliation, atonement, redemption, are beyond him. Let him face up to his own self-accusations and inquire the meaning and implications of these. He has a belief, or these would not rise disturbingly within him. He believes in the moral imperative. Let him explore the significance of it. He will go further. It is a real beginning when our moral helplessness is faced fairly. Redemption is not to be treated as an intellectual puzzle. It was not a problem, but a Person, who gave Himself for us on the Cross. The sense of sin and the experience of redemption are two things which God hath joined together and none can put asunder.

By its insistent self-enlargement let us test our faith. If it is a faith which will not let us grow, or that limits and narrows us, we must get rid of it. A vital faith has no finality because its object has no limit. Jesus never said, 'There is no more to believe.' He said, 'I will send you another Paraclete. He will guide you into all truth.'[1]

NINTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

God's Difficulties.

'For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might shew my power in thee.'—Ro 9^{17}.

There is nothing in the story of the Old Testament to suggest that any one was responsible for the experience of Israel in Egypt save God only. 'Fear not to go down into Egypt' are the words which Jacob recognizes as an intimation of the Divine Will. The famine was sore in the land. And in Egypt there was corn, gathered by the wise providence of his own brilliant son.

In those rough times the treachery of Judah and his brothers, wicked though it might be, was not altogether without excuse. Genius is often insufferable in its early stages, and virtue is not always recommended by precocity. Joseph would not have been exactly loved if his lot had been cast in one of the public schools of modern England. But, whatever punishment their cruelty and deceit may have deserved, it was under Joseph's protection that the patriarchal family was at last comfortably settled in the Land of Goshen. What is prominent in the Book of Genesis is the Divine ordering of events, and this is recognized by Joseph himself. 'God sent me before you,' are the words which he addresses to his conscience-stricken brethren, 'to preserve life.' And the 105th Psalm ascribes the whole story of the descent into Egypt, not to the consequences of sin, but to the working of Divine Providence.

What, then, does Egypt stand for in the accom-

[1] T. Yates, *The Strategies of Grace*, 58.

plishment of God's designs? Through no fault of their own, through no unfaithfulness to the mind and will of the heavenly Father concerning them, this race with its promise of a great future, its hope of a high destiny, is subjected to the grinding tyranny of a remorseless civilization. Into their soul the iron entered, but no prince of the people let them go free. Why, if the God of Israel be He who rules all things, did He not attain His end by a road less rough, a way less painful for the feet of His saints, than one which, like the old paths of the slave-raider in Central Africa, was strewn with dead bodies and bleaching bones?

Beware of suburban views of God! The last thing that we ought to think of revelation is that it will make the experience of life easy. People who argue that it should are of all men the most unpractical. There is a grave danger lest we should be blind to the lessons of history. The welfare of a nation is not necessarily bound up with the mitigation of immediate suffering. In times of stress and difficulty we may learn a great deal from what the Bible has to tell us about the sorrows of Israel in Egypt. What in the history of God's people is the meaning of Pharaoh? St. Paul, slightly paraphrasing the text of the Old Testament, gives the answer. The words he cites were addressed to Rameses II., the Pharaoh of the Exodus, whose cruel, hard, supercilious features look down upon us to-day from the walls of the British Museum. 'For this very purpose did I raise thee up, that I might shew thee my power.' But how can this be? If you can only crush a serpent's head by allowing it to bruise your heel, surely this is something less than omnipotence.

Most of the difficulties that beset men's minds with regard to God arise out of constructing Him in their own image before they will consent to seek Him in His actual working. The provincial free-thinker constructs an enlarged portrait of himself, and has then no difficulty in proving that such a personality does not exist. When the day comes that we shall know as we are known, shall we not be amazed at our own views of God, at what seemed to us to be the meaning of omnipotence, at what we thought were the necessities of a boundless love? We ought to bring the same frame of mind to the study of the ways of God as that in which we approach all other branches of knowledge. When we are engaged in the pursuit of positive science, it is not the essential nature of the facts that we examine. What they are in themselves is a mystery that eludes our method of inquiry. What we do wish to learn is the best means of acting upon them. In other words, it is the destiny and not the origin of the universe which is the proper subject of human investigation. If God be Life—conscious, purposeful, personal Life—how do I know what obstacles He may not have had to encounter in the earlier stages of His creative activity? How do I know that self-realization in matter may not have encompassed Him with limitations not altogether unlike those which, as experience shows, have been imposed upon ourselves? How do I know that a universe could have been summoned into existence in which conflict with evil was not the essential condition of the establishment of the Kingdom of God?

Of the answer to these questions we know nothing. For all minds alike clouds and darkness surround the origin of things. It is not in the annihilation of difficulty, but in the bending of difficulty to the accomplishment of His victorious Will do we see the salvation of God.

The Bible is the record of God's victorious working amid the actual conditions of the world's development. The universe is God's great opportunity, as it is ours. Ask those emancipated Israelites whether they would be without one hour of that harsh captivity. Ask Miriam and her jubilant dancers whether they do not understand the place of Pharaoh in the purposes of God. Amid the clash of the timbrels the answer comes: 'Sing unto the Lord, for he hath triumphed gloriously. The horse and his rider hath he thrown into the sea.'

We can understand God's triumph in history, because it is a human victory. 'In all their affliction he was afflicted,' cried the great prophet of the Exile, 'and the angel of His presence saved them.' It is when, sharing our risks and bearing our sorrows, He becomes our Redeemer, that we become aware of the mighty fact that God is our Father. What is the spiritual significance of the Temptation of Jesus Christ but this? It clinches and brings to a supreme issue what has been suggested all down the pages of revelation. Our God is a human God. When Jesus is tempted to make stones bread, or perhaps to doubt His own prerogative of Deity, we miss the whole force of the evil suggestion if we set in sharp contrast the Godhead and the Manhood of the Saviour. We think of God as one to whom it would be quite natural to make stones bread, and we think of the kingdoms of this world as belonging to the Almighty without any effort on His part to win them. But surely there is something extraordinarily mechanical and unreal about the taking of the Manhood unto God,

if it is only thus that we can represent it to ourselves. To separate the Godhead of Christ from His Manhood is a task as impossible as it is unnecessary. The earthly story which culminated in the Cross is the last and fullest exposition of the Humanity of God. If we are made in God's image, then God is like us. Our conception of His power must never make us think of Him as some superior genie, who builds enchanted palaces. God has His difficulties. That is how He is ever represented in the Bible, and no consideration of the mystery that surrounds His existence should rob us of the wondrous picture of a personal, living God. If 'men may rise on stepping-stones of their dead selves to higher things,' can we not understand how this process may correspond to something in the very heart of God? It is of the very essence of personal life to be lifted on the waves of difficulty to the accomplishment of its purposes. Difficulty is the means of salvation. For us as we encounter the storms of life, what gives us courage—a man's courage—with which to grapple the tempest is the Presence in the boat.

The difficulties of God are consummated on Calvary. Men have always found the Cross a cause of offence. That God should die, that the last great obstacle to the development of their own lives should reappear in the history of God, seems to them scandalous indeed. They imagine that somehow we should be able to accept the declaration that God is love, that He forgives iniquity and sin, though the declaration had no relation whatever to the fact of Golgotha. Tell us the Parable of the Prodigal Son, and we want nothing further than that touching story to make us arise and go to our Father.

But we cannot separate the story from Him who told it. Love has not proved itself to the uttermost till it has broken every barrier down. In the world as we know it love must encounter dangers, it must wrestle with death, if it is to reach the fulness of its glorious perfection. O Cross, O Tree of suffering and of glory, this is the word which the Lord hath spoken of thee: 'For this very purpose did I raise them up, that I might shew in thee the power of my prevailing love.'[1]

[1] J. G. Simpson, *Great Ideas of Religion*, 103.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Christianity in China.

In the earlier volumes of his *History of Evangelical Missions* Dr. Richter has dealt respectively with India, Islam, and Africa. With the publication of vol. iv. on 'China,'[1] his great task is completed. He has laid all Protestant churches under great obligation alike by his extensive researches spread over many years, and by his careful sifting and skilful arranging of the immense mass of material. In spite of the difficulty of writing about China in these days of kaleidoscopic changes, the time is held to be opportune for the publication of this volume, inasmuch as the Shanghai Conference (1922) marks the beginning of a new era in the history of Chinese missions. It is estimated that there are three-quarters of a million of Protestant Christians in China, and that, out of eight, one is a member or adherent of some continental church, three are attached to British, and four to American churches.

[1] *Allgemeine Evangelische Missionsgeschichte*, Band iv. 'Das Werden der christlichen Kirche in China.' Von Professor *D.* Julius Richter (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann; Seiten xvi, 584. M.25).

A chapter is devoted to Jesuit missions (1583–1773), and another to the beginnings of Evangelical missions (1807–1840), full justice being done to the 'distinguished personality' and literary activity of Robert Morrison. The work in the five Treaty ports (1840–1860) is sympathetically described, and there are dissertations on the Opium War, the Taiping Rebellion, etc. Subsequent history is divided under the following headings: from the Peace of Pekin to the Boxer Rebellion, from the Boxer Rebellion to the Revolution, and the Republican Era. There are chapters on Medical Missions, Work amongst Women, Bible Translations, and Persecutions. Deep regret is expressed at the withdrawal of the China Inland Mission (1926) from the National Christian Council. A noteworthy feature of this work, greatly increasing its value, is that 200 pages are given to detailed histories of the missions classified geographically. For example, under such headings as Canton and the Hinterland, Shantung, Hunan, etc., a summary is given of the work of the various societies in each place and of their present condition.

Dr. Richter's encyclopædic history will be a standard work of reference for all the churches.

Its statistics are brought up to date, and no pains have been spared to secure accuracy of statement concerning matters ecclesiastical, biographical, and historical. It was inevitable that in a narrative of missionary work in China reference should be made to the relations of the European powers to that country. With most of the strictures passed upon their dealings with the nation there will be general agreement, and Dr. Richter's analysis of the present situation helps his readers to distinguish between the religious and the political elements in the peoples' hatred of foreigners. But as missionaries of a former generation are charged with looking at the Chinese through 'coloured spectacles,' and of painting, in consequence, a too gloomy picture, it must also be said that the political judgments in this work are not always free from bias. For example, it is recorded, without comment, that the Germans seized Shantung, but that 'the ever modest Great Britain claimed *only* the whole, enormously rich Yangtze basin.'

To the series of Studies in the History and Civilizations of the East, now entitled *Morgenland,* and formerly '*Beihefte zum alten Orient*,' the Editor, Dr. Wilhelm Schubart, contributes an essay on 'Das Weltbild Jesu.'[1] His aim is to describe not *Die Welt Jesu,* or the world as it was in His time; but the world as Jesus saw it, and then to discover His attitude towards the world He knew. The environment of Jesus is vividly sketched, and the influence upon Him of the ideals of His age is traced. 'Neither an ascetic, nor a scholarly recluse was he, but a man of the people to whom nothing that is human was alien.' The world as Jesus ideally viewed it was the Kingdom of God, though before that Kingdom could come the powers of evil must be fought and overcome. The different conceptions of the Kingdom which are implied in the words of Jesus are instructively compared. Within the limits imposed by himself, Dr. Schubart's study is arresting and suggestive. J. G. TASKER.

Leamington Spa.

Varia.

A series of lectures,[2] delivered by Jewish scholars in connexion with the Institutum Judaicum founded by Strack, deals mainly with post-Biblical Judaism and is introduced by the late Professor Gressmann, whose interest in every aspect of Judaism was encyclopædic. Gressmann offers a brief but excellent sketch of pre-exilic religion, drawing in bold attractive outlines the message of the great prophets. Elbogen discusses the relation of Ezra to post-exilic Judaism, explaining Ezra's drastic prohibition of intermarriage with foreigners as necessitated by the obligation of Israel to maintain her religious distinctiveness. Bergmann in his lecture on Judaism in the Græco-Roman period shows that in the Jewish attitude to the pagan world there was tolerance as well as intolerance, propaganda as well as polemic. Michael Guttmann deals with the origin of the Talmud and makes the suggestive comment that it is best understood as composed, not of so many volumes, but rather of persons who meet to discuss and dispute—a veritable 'living book.' A very acute discussion of the Religious Motives in the Philosophy of Maimonides is presented by Julius Guttmann, who points out that the key to that philosophy is found in regarding it as a synthesis of Judaism and Aristotelianism. The series closes with a discussion by Baeck of the Origin of Jewish Mysticism, a religious development for which there is little support in the Old Testament. Different as are the topics treated in this volume, two ideas run through practically all of them: one is the joy of the true Jew in the Torah—if the Law was a yoke, it was a yoke borne gladly: the other is the intense emphasis upon the ethical aspect of religion, conspicuous alike in Jewish mysticism and the philosophy of religion. The prophets did not live in vain, they left an indelible mark upon the whole subsequent development of their people.

Most Christians who know anything about the Jews at all are better acquainted with the ancient than the modern aspects of their religion: the synagogue is as unfamiliar to them as a mosque. Else Schubert-Christaller has written a little book on *The Worship of the Synagogue*,[3] which is well fitted to extend our knowledge of the modern Jew in his hours of worship. In four brief but informing chapters she discusses the prayers, and to some extent the liturgical customs, connected with week-days, the Sabbath, the three great festivals, the solemn New Year's Day, and the Day of Atonement. Each chapter is prefaced by a brief

[1] *Morgenland: Darstellungen aus Geschichte und Kultur des Ostens,* Heft 13 (Leipzig: Hinrichs; geh. M.2).

[2] *Entwicklungsstufen der Jüdischen Religion* (Töpelmann, Giessen; geh. Mk.3.20; geb. Mk.4.50).

[3] *Der Gottesdienst der Synagoge,* von Else Schubert-Christaller (Töpelmann, Giessen; geh. Mk.2.70; geb. Mk.4).

introduction, but the bulk of the book consists of liturgical prayers. These let us look into the wonderful range and depth of the Jewish religious spirit which, alike in its abounding delight in the Sabbath and in its contrition for sin, recognizes that the God who is greatly to be feared is nevertheless 'my God.' A welcome and valuable book.

Gustaf Dalman has placed some of the fruits of his long and intimate acquaintance with Palestine at the disposal of all readers interested in the Bible in a volume,[1] dealing more particularly with the work and the customs of the peasants of Palestine, as these are determined by the changing year. The temperature, rains, winds, trees, plants, harvests, animals, insects, festivals, everything indeed that affects or is connected with the general life of the country as that is conditioned by the successive seasons of the year, is here carefully recorded and discussed with a fulness of knowledge which betrays on every page the hand of the scholar who is at once a master of Biblical and Rabbinical literature, an acute and patient observer of natural phenomena, and a trusted friend of the people who knows their language thoroughly and who is as completely at home in their country as he is in his own. In the Arabic sentences and proverbs which are profusely sprinkled over the book we hear the living voice of the people of to-day. The book is, in short, a Biblical Archæology which differs from other volumes dealing with this theme in starting with the contemporary life of Palestine and working back to the Bible. The writer speaks with gratitude of all he learned from those people, many of them illiterate, whose life was none the less happy because they lived in an environment comparatively unaffected by the creations of machinery and electricity; and in a form which is not only readable but fascinating he has passed that knowledge on to us.

Two brochures have lately appeared, one in the 'Philosophie und Geschichte' series, the other in the 'Sammlung gemeinverständlicher Vorträge.' In the former,[2] Rudi Paret traces the influence of Islam in the colouring given by the popular literature of Arabia to the story of the Muhammadan conquests. We learn how readily and how speedily history became distorted into legend, and how popular imagination could transform the heroes of ancient Arabia into champions of Islam or precursors of Muhammad. However slender the historical value of such romances may be, they throw interesting sidelights on the popular religion and illustrate the actual religious life of Islam better than do the works of theologians.

The other booklet,[3] by Professor Frick, discusses the proper mode of interpreting the Bible. How is the spiritual understanding of it related to the scientific understanding? Frick is just to both orders of interest, but he pleads that a strictly scientific exegesis, which is indispensable as a basis, is not enough. The voice of God speaking to us in the Bible can only be heard through the atmosphere of prayer.

Recent numbers of the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*,[4] which is being so ably edited by Professor Hempel, are crowded with stimulating discussions, through which one feels the increasing complexity of Old Testament problems. We have only space to refer to Staerk's discussion of the 'Ebed-Jahwe Problem,' which is followed by Marmorstein's interpretation of Is 53—both of which discussions show how little the collective interpretation of the Servant may be said to have triumphed. A long and valuable article by Professor Budde defends the current critical view of Deuteronomy, which connects it with the Reformation of Josiah, against the earlier and later dates held by Löhr on the one hand and Hölscher on the other. Fine tributes are paid to the work and worth of the late Professor Gressmann by Professors Titius, Sellin, Hempel, and T. H. Robinson.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

---

[1] *Arbeit und Sitte in Palästina*, Bd. 1 (Bertelsmann, Gütersloh; geh. Mk.12.50; geb. Mk.15).

[2] *Die Geschichte des Islams im Spiegel der Arabischen Volksliteratur* (Mohr, Tübingen; Mk.1.50).

[3] *Wissenschaftliches und Pneumatisches Verständniss der Bibel* (Mohr, Tübingen; Mk.1.50).

[4] Töpelmann, Giessen.

Jesus our Advocate.

A FREE EXPOSITON OF 1 JOHN II. 1, 2.

By the Reverend A. Gordon James, of the West London Mission.

So much has been written on the sacrificial aspects of the Atonement that it would seem to be a presumption for an ordinary working pastor, who has no claim to be a theologian, to re-open the question. This, however, may be urged as an excuse—whether or not it be sufficient as a reason. The average minister of religion is much too busy to undertake independent research work himself; he has to rely upon the specialist to keep him acquainted with the movement of theological thought. He is like a soldier in the firing line: he is preoccupied with his particular tasks of defence and attack and he blazes away with such ammunition as he receives. But if he is kept short or supplied with the wrong kind of ammunition for the weapon he is using, he may be compelled to retreat. And if that happens on any large scale the battle may be lost.

At the present time many of us who occupy strategic positions on a very wide battle front feel that we are not being adequately supplied with the munitions of war; to speak plainly, the specialists are not helping us. They are not sending us the right kind of theological ammunition, suitable to present-day conditions. We are getting arrows for bows instead of bullets for rifles; and we are fighting at a serious disadvantage in consequence. We shall not give in; but if our needs are not more fully met, we shall be compelled to fall back upon the more amateurish—but at least appropriate—weapons of our own devising.

The exposition of the extremely difficult passage under discussion which is here suggested is the writer's own attempt to meet at least one need of the practical Christian apologist, who, despairing of his ability to use the theological material provided by the expert, has to endeavour to shape methods of interpretation suitable to his situation. He is confronted by a mass of paganism, stolid indifference (despite all the 'popular' religious articles in the daily press), and a spirit of scornful disbelief from the majority of the younger generation of University students, who feed on Shaw, Galsworthy, and Wells (not to mention Arnold Bennett), and consider themselves theologically equipped thereby. To these immature but inquiring minds the Atonement is not only meaningless; it is an offence to men and an insult to God. Why should man require an 'Advocate' with God, as though he were on his trial in a court of law and needed legal assistance in putting his case? Did the Prodigal Son brief a lawyer to defend him before his father would receive him? No, it was enough for him to say, 'I will arise, and go to my father.' Again, why should an ugly word like 'Propitiation' obtrude itself into any religion, least of all the Christian? Is God like an Oriental judge who will register a verdict in favour of the side which offers the largest bribe? Did the father of the prodigal need to be coaxed, cajoled, propitiated, before he would offer his boy a welcome? No: 'while he was yet afar off, his father saw him, and was moved with compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck, and kissed him.'

So speaks the voice of modern youth; nor will it be silenced. To reply with a long and reasoned argument setting forth the meaning of words like 'Advocate'[1] and 'Propitiation'[2] convinces nobody; and in addition gives the 'old-fashioned believer' the impression that one is tampering with the faith once delivered to the saints. To fall back on the silly device of referring the objector to the Gospels as though the Epistles were comparatively unimportant and their writers mistaken is to defeat one's end. Because, if Paul or John or James wrongly interpreted the Christian message, what guarantee have we that our interpretations are not equally mistaken? Have we a larger inspiration or a fuller knowledge than the Christian apologists of the first century? Possibly; but if we are wise we shall not claim it; for after all, the pioneers of the faith, simply because they were pioneers, were probably in a better position to know what the faith was than we are to-day.

There are two reasons which prevent us from

[1] Gr. *παράκλητος*: lit. 'called to one side.' In 1 Jn 2^1 used in the sense of 'the counsel for the defence'—the 'prisoner's friend.'

[2] Gr. *ἱλασμός* (cf. also *ἱλαστήριον* and *ἱλάσκομαι*). Class. 'appeasement' or 'to appease.' In LXX used of 'gift' or 'sacrifice.' In N.T. used with different emphasis by different writers, but in general bears the idea of expiation or conciliation. Cf. 'To wipe clean the face blackened by displeasure.'—W. R. Smith.

succumbing to the superficially attractive suggestion that the Gospels provide us with a Christianity which is somehow different from what we find in the Epistles, in that it is in the main the record of the sublime teaching of the greatest of men. The first is that Jesus Himself emphasized the fact that He was more than a teacher of righteousness. If He said 'Follow me,' He also said 'Come unto me.' He believed that He had been sent into the world to accomplish a mighty work for God which none other could do. What was that work? The Epistles are an attempt to provide the answer to that question.

The second reason for retaining the Epistles as a necessary part of the Christian revelation is that we are frequently made aware of the fact that the New Testament writers are arguing against false teaching. They are defending the faith against attack; and that being so, they are hardly likely to make mistakes in the statement of their own position. This is true of the writer of the First Epistle of John. If he says that Jesus is our 'Advocate,' it is because he gave that value to our Lord in his own experience and found it adequate. If he declares that Christ is the 'propitiation' for the sins of the whole world, it must imply that the early Church believed that Jesus did actually do for them what a propitiatory sacrifice did for others. We cannot ride off by saying that this is an accommodation to local ideas, for the very purpose of this Epistle is to protest against any 'watering down' of the gospel message to suit such conditions. Indeed, the trouble in primitive Christianity was that it refused to accommodate its thought or compromise its experience with anybody. We must therefore dig deeper yet.

The particular heresy which the writer was attacking is Gnosticism, according to which human salvation depended less upon faith than upon knowledge, and knowledge of a particular kind. To be 'initiated' into certain dark and mysterious secrets was automatically to be put right with God. Again, the Gnostics held that spirit and matter were wholly opposed to each other, and that sin resided entirely in the flesh. Hence the flesh was either treated as an enemy or else pampered; indeed, some held that the lowest physical passions could be gratified without sin, since what touched the flesh could not harm the spirit.

Again and again the New Testament writers attack this position. On the one hand, they assert that as Christ had come in the flesh, the flesh could not be wholly evil, even though at times it warred against the spirit. On the other hand, they declare that 'if we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves.' They are concerned far more with getting rid of sin than with abstruse calculations as to its original cause or its final meaning. They assert with almost wearisome reiteration that Christ's most important work is to abolish evil in all its forms. They emphasize the moral power of Christ rather than the beauty of His teaching; which is precisely what is most needed to-day. The world is flooded with compliments to Jesus—yet to all appearances the world is going to the devil. If Christ is to save men, it can only be by the application of an energy that will expunge sin both from the life of the individual and from the life of society.

How did the religious world of the writers of the New Testament propose to deal with sin? Here we may draw an illustration from Judaism, not merely because it was the highest and purest of all the pre-Christian faiths, but also because it provided the soil out of which Christianity blossomed. If a Jew desired to cleanse himself from sin he brought a sacrifice, which the priest accepted and offered on his behalf to Jehovah. In other words, Jehovah had to be 'propitiated.' More or less all other religions approached their deities by the same method. The whole world was saturated with the idea that the only way to secure the favour of the gods was to bribe them. We ought not to shrink from the word 'bribe'; after all, bribery was (and to a large extent still is) the key which in the East unlocked every door. If a man desired justice, he bribed the judge. If he wanted his taxes remitted, he bribed the tax-collector. Is it altogether surprising that men imagined that this key would also unlock the gates of heaven? Again, if a man wished to make a purchase, he haggled over it until the price came down to a reasonable level. In like manner he sought to haggle with his god. To bribe God with a sacrifice; to bargain with God through a priest, why not? What, indeed, could be more natural?

What the Christian apologists said therefore was not, as the theologians will insist on telling us, that God was to be 'propitiated' through Jesus, and therefore no other sacrifice was necessary (it may be admitted that the theologians tone this down by ingeniously endeavouring to denude 'propitiation' of the idea of bribery altogether—a vain and impossible proceeding!); they said rather, 'What you find in your sacrifice, we find in Jesus. Whatever help you derive from your priest, we obtain from our Christ. If you really need an Advocate in God, then let Jesus be your Advocate. If you must make propitiation for your sins, then let Christ be your propitiator.' In other words,

they claimed for their Lord the highest religious values, and by implication made propitiation and advocacy altogether unnecessary. To suggest that God is angry with mankind and that Jesus offered Himself as an 'appeasement' of the Divine wrath is, as many recognize to-day, unchristian. But why is it necessary to substitute for that obsolete interpretation of the Atonement other forms of expression in which men vainly seek to hold fast to a notion of propitiation which ought long since to have been abandoned? 'If we confess our sins,' writes John, 'he is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness' (1 Jn 1^9). That is tantamount to saying: Here at last is a God to whom the most desperate sinner can come and be quite sure of forgiveness. There is no further need for priest, sacrifice and altar; for propitiation or for advocacy; for mystic rite or carefully guarded ceremonial. God forgives because He is righteous; He cleanses because He is faithful.

This is the gospel, as some of us have to preach it. We recognize that what give this gospel its power and validity are the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins' (1 Jn 4^{10}). How we have haggled over those words; now insisting that they must be taken as they stand as a theological definition of the atoning work of Christ, now trying to make terms with what is called 'modern thought' by giving to 'propitiation' a meaning which the writer would never have recognized. Let us omit the words 'to be'; they are not found in the Greek, but were inserted by the translators in order to avoid ambiguity. The idea can then be expressed thus: God loved us and sent His Son to do for us what men could not do for themselves yet always longed to have done for them, namely, to forgive their sins. The propitiatory sacrifice was the avenue through which man attempted to buy forgiveness from God. That has gone—there is no need for it; for Christ is now identified with man and becomes the only means whereby man is lifted up to God and receives the assurance of pardon.

The gospel is no mere philosophical theory or theological proposition. It is not a programme for material betterment. To quote the words of the Lausanne Conference, unanimously accepted by the representatives of all the Churches in Christendom (with the unhappy exception of the Roman Catholics, though including delegates from the Greek Church), it is—

> 'the joyful message of redemption, both here and hereafter—the gift of God to sinful man through Jesus Christ.'

In the far-off days, when primitive Christianity was fighting for its existence, men saw in Jesus One whom they could not only safely put in the place of all other forms of worship, but preach as the final satisfaction of humanity's need. For them Christ was everything. Whatever God it was who had created the universe, Christ could lift them up to His level. However sinful man might be, his case was safe with Christ. However far off man might seem to be from God, Christ could bring him near. What was true then is true now; what we have to do is to make men realize it.

Contributions and Comments.

The Anointing at Bethany and its Significance.

There are two anointings of our Lord's feet related in the Gospels, and they both roused the indignation of unloving hearts.

Simon, in Lk 7, early in our Lord's ministry, grumbles because Jesus allowed a woman known to have been of bad character to touch Him: Judas Iscariot in Jn 12, a week before the Crucifixion, because Mary of Bethany had lavished her expensive ointment on the Master's feet, when Judas himself would have liked to have had the handling of the price it might have fetched.

One anointing wins a sentence of unparalleled commendation, the other only a chivalrous defence of penitent affection: 'She has been forgiven much, and therefore loves much': and it receives no assurance of world-wide remembrance, indeed it is mentioned but by one of the four Evangelists. In both cases there is a generous giving of costly ointment, and in both the ointment-box or vessel is also valuable; we are therefore led to ask why

in the one case is the praise given so much greater than in the other, when the actions, at first sight, appear so nearly the same.

St. Luke, who does not record the Bethany incident, does, however, record a word of great significance about Mary of Bethany. When Martha, in her loving anxiety to give our Lord the best possible entertainment, would have Mary join her in elaborating the feast, our Lord says of Mary that she had chosen the good part which should not be taken from her. If St. Luke was aware of the statement about the memorial of the anointing being made throughout the world, then his record of the good part, not to be taken away, is doubly significant.

Again, when we consider other actions which our Lord signals out for special recognition, we find they are associated with special faith or insight. 'Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jonah, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father which is in heaven.' 'Verily I say unto you, I have not found so great faith, no, not in Israel.' 'O woman, great is thy faith, be it unto thee even as thou wilt.'

Following this clue we may expect to find in Mary's action an indication of special insight. Our Lord intimates that she had seized a passing opportunity, 'me ye have not always'; and He associates the anointing in some way with His burial.

It has been generally assumed that while others were anticipating a triumph—'Blessed is the kingdom that cometh' was the cry of the multitude, and the Twelve were disputing as to precedence in the kingdom that was to be—Mary foresaw disaster. But would a gloomy foreboding of tragedy to come make that difference in the values we have seen our Lord setting on the two anointings. Thomas's 'Let us also go, that we may die with Him,' wins no special approval.

Let us look again at the words used. St. Mark's account may be phrased, 'What she had, she rendered; she has forestalled my burial, the wrapping of my body in spices, as is the manner of the Jews to bury.' St. Matthew's, 'She has done this against my burial.' Bishop Lightfoot, in his note on Col 2^{23}, says that *pros*, like our English *for*, when used after words denoting utility, value, sufficiency, not uncommonly introduces the object to check or prevent or cure which the thing is to be employed. See also Thayer's Grimm under *pros* i. 1 *c*. Lastly, St. John, reading as in T.R., 'Let her alone, she has kept it up to now for my burial, but now she uses it in a way I welcome,' or, adopting the R.V. text, 'Let her alone; she had preserved her treasure until now that she might keep it for my burial, but now she uses it with my approval.'

What had led her to change her purpose? She looked from Lazarus to Jesus: 'The Master is the resurrection and the life, can he need spices to preserve him, when my brother came forth untainted from the grave? Even if he die, as he has said, he will rise again. I salute the Lord of life, I crown him victor.' Here was an insight commensurate with the praise bestowed. Here was an insight which merited the word, 'Blessed is she that hath not seen, and yet hath believed,' St. John's equivalent to the praise in St. Matthew and St. Mark, or to St. Luke's 'good part, not to be taken away.' Here was an insight to justify also St. John's introduction of Mary in chapter 11 as the Mary of the well-known anointing. Here was one who 'while she had the light, believed on the light, that she might become a child of the light.' It is true she was not able to express her faith to others, not able to make it articulate, but pondering these things in her heart she was neither at the Cross nor at the tomb, but her Lord had understood her meaning, and it had greatly refreshed and cheered His heart; the house was filled with the odour of the ointment. Later on the empty tomb led St. John to realize, without seeing Him, that his Master was risen, but knowing Mary's insight surpassed his own he placed her act alongside of the raising of Lazarus in the very heart of his spiritual Gospel. 'These things understood not his disciples at the first: but when Jesus was glorified, then remembered they that these things were written of him, that he must rise again from the dead, and that they had done these things unto him' (Jn 12^{16} 20^{9}).

To Mary of Nazareth it was given to be the first to welcome the message of the Incarnation, and to Mary of Bethany first to believe the foretelling of the Resurrection. So doing she strengthened the sense of the joy that was set before her Master, and He endured the Cross, despising the shame. 'Wheresoever in the world this gospel is preached there also that this woman hath done shall be told as a memorial of her.'

J. A. Wood.

Witherley Rectory, Atherstone.

The Relation of Sin and Death in Romans v.

What is Paul's idea of the relation of sin and death? It is generally answered that death is the

punishment of sin (Ro 6^{23}). 'The wages of sin is death' is often given as a proof text, but the chief ground for the answer is generally found in the previous chapter (5^{12-21}). This important passage traces the entry of death into the world to Adam's sin; and under the influence of the Augustinian doctrine of Original Sin it used to be interpreted to mean that all his descendants sinned in Adam, and so were guilty of his sin. It is now generally admitted that this interpretation is mistaken. Augustine read '*in quo*' in the Latin as the translation of the ἐφ' ᾧ of v.^{12}, and translated it to mean 'in whom (Adam) all sinned,' whereas it almost certainly means 'because all sinned.'

But if Paul means 'all died because all sinned,' another difficulty arises. He also says, 'sin is not imputed when there is no law' (5^{13b}). If this is so, how can it be said that all have sinned, and how can it be right for them to suffer death, the punishment of sin?

Dr. N. P. Williams in his learned and profound Bampton lectures offers an explanation. He points out that according to Paul's principle, 'no law, no sin,' the pre-Mosaic generations cannot be said to have 'sinned.' Yet Paul seems to suggest that they did sin, and they certainly paid the penalty of sin, 'death.'

> 'The answer,' he says, 'to the problem which shapes itself in the mind of the Apostle is, that during the pre-Mosaic period the human race, though incapable of committing sin in the strict sense of the term, was nevertheless *penetrated and infected by the miasma of a vague and undefined abstract "sinfulness"* (his italics). It would seem, in other words, that he invokes in his own thoughts the conception of "original sin" in what the sequel will show to have been a somewhat nebulous form, in order to explain the universal domination of death at an epoch when, according to the Jewish view of the Decalogue as the sole embodiment of the moral law, "actual sin" did not and could not exist' (p. 128).
>
> Again, he says, quoting a hypothetical line of thought in Paul's mind, 'though the pre-Mosaic generations could not commit sinful *acts*, they were hereditarily constituted in a sinful *state*' (p. 129).

One naturally feels great hesitation in differing from Dr. Williams, yet I am bound to say that this explanation does not seem to me possible, for it was not the substantive acts which Paul denied to the pre-Mosaic generations on the basis of his theory about the Law, it was the adjective 'sinful.' To deny the sinful acts and posit instead a sinful state or a vague, undefined, abstract 'sinfulness,' gets us no nearer to the Apostle's view, and, in fact, is contrary to his explicit statements. There was nothing either vague or abstract or undefined about the evils which Paul recognized as typical of the Gentiles in the world of his own day, who were at least approximately in the same position with regard to law as were the pre-Mosaic generations (see Ro 1). In fact, if we are to make a distinction between state and acts, a contemplation of the facts of their evil deeds on the one hand, and of their being without positive law on the other, would lead us to say that their acts were sinful, *i.e.* contrary to law, but their state, in so far as it was not conscious of law, was innocent.

It is true, on the other hand, that to Paul it was the Law's prohibition which constituted sin. In other words, only after the explicit declaration that anything ought not to be done can a man be blamed for doing it. The Law, that is to say, establishes the guilt of sin. But whether there be a law or no, some lines of conduct lead towards social health, others towards social disease. Till law recognizes this, and so commands men to go in the one direction and warns against the other, any one may without guilt do great evil. According to Paul's view, God does not then regard him as a sinner, but the consequences of his wrong deed still remain evil.

The distinction which underlies the Apostle's thought here, then, is not that between acts and state. It concerns the adjective 'sinful' and implies the denial of guilt to those, who, not knowing the Law, have committed acts contrary to it. So far as I can see, he can only mean by this passage in Ro 5 that though while the Law was not promulgated God did not blame those who did wrong and did not reckon them sinners, yet for all that they died as a consequence of their sin. And this in its turn can only mean that *Paul did not regard death in the strict sense as the Divinely inflicted punishment for sin, but as its natural consequence.* For to think of death as the punishment of sin requires us to suppose that God reckoned up men's sins to them and passed a verdict of condemnation upon them, which is exactly what is denied in the words 'sin was not imputed.'

To think of death as the natural consequences of sin harmonizes well with Paul's words here and elsewhere. It implies that there are two parallel and related but not necessarily coincident sequences: a course of wrong-doing issuing in death, and

conscious breaking of the Divine law issuing in a Divine verdict of guilty. There are emphatic words in Ro 2 in which Paul seems to say exactly this: 'As many as have sinned without the law shall also perish without the law: and as many as have sinned under the law shall be judged by the law' (Ro 2^{12}).

This position is confirmed by a careful study of Paul's doctrine of the 'wrath of God' given in Ro 1. It is natural to suppose from the phrase 'wrath of God' that a personal, passionate Divine intervention is intended. But the state of things which Paul depicts is simply sin taking its natural course in leading to more sin and consequent spiritual degradation. It is no action of God, but rather His inaction. If Paul had in these verses stressed the suffering of body and mind which men bring upon themselves by sinning, it might perhaps reasonably be supposed that he regarded the process as a Divine intervention in punishment. But throughout no stress whatever is laid on suffering, which is in fact not mentioned; the whole stress is on increased sin. Moreover, the final state of things depicted is summarized in the words ἀδόκιμος νοῦς (R.V. 'reprobate mind'), which may well be translated 'a mind incapable of right judgment.' To have such a mind need not necessarily be particularly painful to its possessor, but it secures that he continues in the course of wrong-doing.

Paul then means in Ro 5 that all wrong-doing has as its end death, not as a Divinely inflicted punishment, but as a natural consequence. When the Law is known and rejected, Divine censure also follows, but where there is no law there is no censure. Only wrong-doing in contravention of known law can be called 'sin' in the full and strict meaning of the term. But in this passage the Apostle by a natural and easy inexactitude also calls wrong-doing apart from law 'sin,' but hastens to explain that it is not properly so-called, and that the sin of Adam's descendants till Moses, being without law, is not like his sin, which was against law.

I submit that this is both a simpler explanation than that of Dr. Williams, and also that it is in accord with the rest of the Apostle's teaching.

W. E. Wilson.

Selly Oak.

Entre Nous.

Mysticism and Religious Education.

'The mystic is not a peculiarly favoured mortal who by a lucky chance has received into his life a windfall from some heavenly Bread-fruit tree, while he lay dreaming of iridescent rainbows. He is, rather, a person who has cultivated, with more strenuous care and discipline than others have done, the native homing passion of the soul for the Beyond, and has creatively developed the outreach of his nature in the God-direction. The result is that he has occasions when the larger Life with which he feels himself kin seems to surround him and answer back to his soul's quest, as a sensitized magnetic needle, if it were conscious, might feel itself enveloped by the currents that sweep back upon it from the electrical storehouse of the sun.'

So Professor Rufus M. Jones in his introduction to *New Studies in Mystical Religion* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net). Starting from this account of the mystic, we turn with special interest to the third chapter, in which Professor Jones deals with Mysticism and Religious Education and pleads for a new emphasis in education. 'The emphasis has been on methods of education that would promote the conquest and control of external nature and that would prepare persons who could *do* things successfully. There is no question about the results. The methods have *worked*. We can fly. We can travel at enormous speed. We can talk around the world. We can see what is happening on the surface of the sun and we are near neighbours with the Pharaohs of Moses' time.

'But unfortunately this conquest of the external world does not make us better men. Our "I.Q." is high, but our hearts are neither trained nor spiritualized. We know a great deal about radium and helium, but we know very little about the deeper processes of the Soul.'

First, he says, education and all that is meant by spiritual culture must be pushed farther back toward the headwaters of the child's life. 'The impulse and urge to correspond with the unseen and the beyond appear very early in life, and they are profoundly, though of course unconsciously,

affected by suggestion and by the social atmosphere of the family and the child's group life.' We should, following the example of the Hebrews and the Greeks, cultivate the imagination of our children. 'We train children to see and to dodge passing automobiles, a skill which is essential to survival, but we neglect the cultivation of the capacity *to see the invisible*, which is essential to art, to poetry, and to religion. I am advocating no slackening of attention to the automobile, but only more attention to the subtler realities which form and build the dimensions of the soul.'

Meditation is one way by which insight may be cultivated. Mothers in India begin to train their children in silent meditation long before they are taught letters or counting, but in our Western civilization it is well-nigh a lost art. 'One of the greatest debts I owe my family for my early religious culture is due to the custom of silent worship every morning after breakfast. It was a busy home with heavy burdens of duties and labours, but we allowed nothing to interfere with the hush of worship which fed our lives with vital energies for the tasks of the day. The habit of turning the mind from outward things and events to an attitude of love and confidence toward an invisible presence became as natural to me as breathing. Children are far more mystical-minded than their elders suspect, and mystics would not be so rare if we made better use of the culture of silence in the lives of our children.'

The right use of great spiritual literature, especially the Bible, is one of the most important influences in the culture of the soul. 'It helps more powerfully than any other influence I know of to foster the experience of unseen things.' But we use it ineffectively in our Sunday schools. 'If chemistry and physics were studied in the same rambling, hit-or-miss fashion which we apply to our study of Scripture we should never have discovered the truth about atoms or electricity. There is a vast amount of illuminating historical material at hand to interpret the background of the Old and the New Testament books. It is possible now to know the dramatic and vital issues which are woven into the tissues of this marvellous literature of the Spirit. There is hardly a line in these books which does not have a deep human interest and appeal, but almost nothing of all this filters down to the teacher of our boys and girls. The dramatic and vital aspects are masked and hidden. The thrilling heroic narrative is spoiled to make place for a pious "lesson." The teacher is not an expert in kindling imagination, in imparting vision, in making the unseen real, in fascinating the hearer with the story of national struggle, personal heroism, and undying loyalty.' In our day schools and colleges, Professor Jones says, we should not wish to 'shackle any man's mind, or to force truth to fit into any traditional moulds, but we should insist that those who train our sons and daughters shall be *reverent interpreters of truth*, persons who feel a genuine concern for the moral and spiritual *effect* of their work upon the making of the lives which pass under their hands.'

'Seminaries where ministers are trained should be nurseries of mystical life and experience. Our theology should spring out of tested and verified experience—the experience of the individual and the race. It should be constantly re-examined and revised, as all truth in this unfolding world should be. . . . But besides all this, every seminary should have one or more experts in the mystical way of life. The cultivation of the inner life must not be left to chance and accident. In using the word "expert," I mean a person who "has been there," who not only knows the literature of this field but who has seriously travelled this way of life. There should be some real experiments made in the use of silence and meditation, and there should be an illuminating course in the writings and interpretations of the great mystics. Technical, historical knowledge is not enough; there is need of sympathetic, appreciative interpretation with, as I have said, some well-guided attempts to practise the presence of God. In all such matters personal leadership counts for most, and disciples will be pretty sure to arrive if the master himself knows and travels the way on in front.'

The other studies in this volume are on 'Mystical Religion and the Abnormal,' 'Mysticism and Asceticism,' 'The Bearing of Mystical Experience on Organization and System,' 'Mystical Experience and Organization.'

The Note of Joy.

The story of the progress of the Church Missionary Society during the year 1927–28 has just been published by the C.M.S. (*Team-Work*; 1s. net). The author is anonymous, but we are told it is written by one who has herself come freshly to the missionary enterprise. In every field—Africa, Near East, China, Japan, and India—there are openings in plenty, but there is a crying need for workers. 'A dispensary was reopened last year in the Punjab after a lapse of many years, and the women came crowding around it. "We have

grown old," they said, "waiting for you to come back."'

The note of joy is recurring. In the chapter on India the author writes, 'Often it is the changed lives of the villagers that bring others —caste and outcaste—into the Church. The Rev. D. L. Welikala of Kandy, Ceylon, received an anonymous letter from a Buddhist: "I like to learn of your religion, because those two Christians living in our village are happier at all times than our people."' One of the early chapters is The Team on Trial in East Africa. During the year Uganda celebrated a jubilee. 'Somehow it seems wonderfully fitting that Uganda should have celebrated a jubilee, for if there is one thing outstanding about the Church in Africa it is the note of joy. Canon Apolo of the pygmy forest is invited to become a Vice-President of the C.M.S., and he replies: "I rejoice greatly to see your very good letter of words of great blessing from God. I rejoice greatly that you elect me to the great council called General Committee; and I, I agree with rejoicing to join that council." The Rev. Andrea Mwaka reports the opening of two new schools in Tanganyika, and says that in other stations there is joy too. A patient in Iganga is told that it was God Who showed the doctors how to heal his leg and make him well. "Yes, that is so," he replied, "and I praise Him." We in England know what praise and joy mean too, but we are more staid, and perhaps a little duller about it all.'

Not Christian.

'Students are glad to come to meetings where they will hear about Jesus, and at the round table conferences that Dr. Stanley Jones is holding everywhere in student India, Christ's Gospel is the theme. Among students and politicians too, the word Christian or Christ-like is used to denote the highest type of man. A Hindu student in Tinnevelly was complaining to his teacher about some action of which he disapproved. "It's wrong, sir," he said, "it isn't Christian."'[1]

Falsehood in War-Time.

Mr. Arthur Ponsonby, M.P., has published a small book with the above title. It contains an assortment of lies circulated throughout all the belligerent nations during the Great War (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d. net). The book should be bought, for though it will not make pleasant, it will make salutary reading. And the atrocity story is still with us. A letter, for example, appeared as recently as April 12, 1927, in the *Evening Star*, Dunedin, New Zealand. 'The writer, Mr. Gordon Catto, answering another correspondent on the subject of atrocities, wrote: "My wife, who in 1914–15 was a nurse in the Ramsgate General Hospital, England, actually nursed Belgian women and children refugees who were the victims of Hun rapacity and fiendishness, the women having had their breasts cut off and the children with their hands hacked off at the wrists."

'Here was almost first-hand evidence noting both time and place. An inquiry was accordingly addressed by a lady investigator to the Secretary of the Ramsgate General Hospital, and the following reply was received:

'"RAMSGATE GENERAL HOSPITAL,
4 CANNON ROAD, RAMSGATE,
11.6.27.

'"DEAR MADAM,—I am at a loss to know how the information about atrocities to women and children, committed by the German soldiers, could have originated in respect to Ramsgate, as there were no such cases received.—Yours faithfully,
(*Signed*) "SYDNEY W. SMITH."'

Is there an atrocity story which we still believe because we got it on such apparently unimpeachable authority? It will be found here with its falsity proved through the efforts of Mr. Ponsonby's investigators. Here are the stories of the passage of Russian troops through Great Britain; the mutilated nurse; the Belgian baby without hands; the corpse factory, and many others. Some of the stories arose through deliberate forgery; others again through a genuine mistake, as in the following instance. There was a notice in *The Times* (agony column), July 9, 1916:

'Jack F. G.—If you are not in khaki by the 20th, I shall cut you dead.—Ethel M.'

The Berlin correspondent of the *Cologne Gazette* transmitted this:

'If you are not in khaki by the 20th, *hacke ich dich zu Tode* (I will hack you to death).'

---

[1] *Team-Work*, 79.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In the opening chapter of Principal H. Wheeler Robinson's recent volume on *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit* (reviewed in another column) there is a useful analysis of the characteristic features of Christian experience, which is the result of the fellowship of God and man through Christ. If that fellowship is ever to become universal, then we should expect that Christian experience should reveal itself as possessed of catholicity, in the sense of being intimately related to human experience in general.

The first postulate of Christian experience seems to be the worth of human personality. 'This gives a cosmic setting to the humblest life; what more can be said of man's importance than that there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth?' The idea of the value of personal life is emphasized in Greek thought, and is sometimes represented as the particular contribution of Greece to the historical preparation for Christianity, but none the less Dr. Robinson is right in insisting that in the Old Testament also man's dignity is normally asserted. In fact, the Old Testament gives to man a meaning in the universal scheme of things which we shall hardly find elsewhere. It is enough to cite in this connexion the prophetic consciousness.

The second characteristic of Christian experience is its central ethical principle, which Dr. Robinson names 'the spirit of the Cross.' In *agape*, a new name for what is essentially a new thing, the Spirit of the Cross is reproduced. The early Christians were conscious of this, and even to-day to be a 'Christian' is to display those qualities of charity, mercy, and forgiveness which are supremely exemplified in the Passion of Jesus. And the example of Jesus provided an interpretation and manifestation of the nature of God. The Spirit of the Cross received, in other words, a 'theological apotheosis,' so that from the beginning Christians could say, 'We love, because He first loved us.'

The third characteristic of Christian experience is deliverance or 'salvation' by grace—deliverance from adversity, moral evil, and death, 'the three great and deep shadows that fall across the human pathway.' In Buddhism deliverance is by escape from the illusion of personality, in Hinduism through union with the supreme Brahman, in Islam through submission to the will of Allah, but in Christianity it comes from the nature of God as revealed by the prophets of Israel and in the Person and Work of Jesus Christ. In all theories of atonement there is a common appeal to the grace of the Divine nature; and in both Protestantism and Roman Catholicism, different as are their conceptions of the mediatorial function of the Church, there is a vital discovery of the Divine nature as gracious.

The fourth characteristic of Christian experience is dependence on the Holy Spirit, by which name

is indicated the new factor in Christianity, the whole activity of the Divine as mediated to the believer through Christ—'through Christ we have our access in one Spirit unto the Father.' It is not that the operation of the Divine spiritual energy is limited by man's consciousness of it, but as a matter of experience it is immeasurably enhanced when psychologically or sacramentally mediated through Jesus Christ. 'In some form or other, this dependence on the Holy Spirit is an essential mark of any experience that deserves to be called Christian.'

Lastly, the fifth characteristic of Christian experience is the corporate realization of the Kingdom of God. The emphasis in the phrase 'Christian society' may be on the adjective 'Christian' or on the noun 'society,' but it is more important to recognize that the foundations of the Christian Church go back beyond the New Testament or even the Old, being grounded in human nature itself, to which the social aspects of personality belong as really as the individual aspects. While there is thus nothing characteristic in the existence of the Christian Church, perhaps its most characteristic feature is its reconciliation of the individual and social aspects of life, or at least in its ideal of their reconciliation.

The record of a spiritual evolution is always of interest and value, especially if it be the outcome of prolonged and strenuous thinking, and if it amounts in the final issue to 'a mental rebirth.' Such is the record embodied in *The Psychology of Socialism*, by Dr. Henry De Man (Allen & Unwin; 16s. net), which has been translated from the German by Eden and Cedar Paul. Dr. De Man, by birth an 'intellectual,' joined the ranks of the socialists in his native city of Amsterdam as long ago as 1871, and he has devoted his life to the cause. A study of the new psychology and, still more, his experience of three years in the trenches led to profound changes in his thought. While still a believer in socialism, he has outgrown Marxism, and he gives his reasons. His book is far more than a personal record. It is one of the most profound and searching criticisms of Marxism that has yet been published. It reveals in the writer an extraordinary knowledge at first hand of socialist movements in Europe and America, and a wonderful insight into the mind of the so-called proletariat (hateful word). In this last respect it is a valuable contribution to psychology.

The War made Dr. De Man a pacifist. 'My personal experience of the war has produced a conviction that I must henceforth abstain from any sort of action which will involve me in war-making or in the preparation for war; and must repudiate the claim of any state or other collectivity that it has the right to dispose of my life—or, through me, of the life of another. . . . A good end, the suppression of war, cannot be achieved by the use of bad means, participation in war. The reason is that warfare sets at work motives which are the driving force of war, and which survive war. It is equally impossible to establish liberty by despotism, to install democracy by dictatorship, and to end the reign of force by the use of force.' All this the writer is clear-sighted and logical enough to apply to the class-war. 'If my inference from my war experience has been that all war is an evil, it is because I can no longer believe in the possibility of attaining a good end by these evil means. Well now, force in the service of a revolution would not act in any different way from force in the service of a war. It would lead away from the goal we wish to reach.'

The criticism of Karl Marx is weighty. Full appreciation is shown of the greatness of the man and of his work. 'Marx was the first to combine into a closely reasoned system the outlook of political economy and the outlook of historical evolution; and he thus effected for the social sciences a step forward analogous to that which Darwin effected for the biological sciences.' But Marxism is now seen to be a product of the materialistic rationalism of the nineteenth century, an age when 'exact science, with whose aid technique was producing such stupendous material values, was supposed to provide the standard by which all values were to be measured.' 'The twentieth

century way of thinking, and, above all, the thought of the post-war epoch, has a very different stamp. What Spengler termed "the century of psychology" no longer believes that human knowledge can be subsumed in logical thought. We are seeking for a conception of the world which, instead of being based upon the indirect experience of the conceptual universe, shall derive from the direct experience of the real universe of feeling and will.' Marx regarded man as nothing but an economic unit whose reaction to his environment was absolutely determined. The new psychology has shown the hopeless inadequacy of this. Reason has not been set aside, but has been given its due place in the hierarchy of human nature.

Man is not governed simply by economic forces, or by considerations of self-interest, or by any conscious reasonings, but by impulses far more profound. 'The men of the nineteenth century, unwilling to hear a word about the possible limits of scientific knowledge, did a great deal to shake the faith of the twentieth century in scientific knowledge. They were far too inclined to find salvation in technical progress and in the increase of knowledge which subserved this progress—as if these things alone would suffice to give us more understanding, more wisdom, and more happiness. Whether they went to church or not they no longer had any religion, no longer had any kind of faith which could say to them, "You ought." They tried to replace their lost faith by science; to make of science, instead of a servant, a master. This idolatry transformed men into the barbarians who revealed themselves in the world-war. There is only one science which can claim to guide us on the path of duty. It is the science of good and evil, in a word, conscience.' Even the Freudian psychoanalysis, dissecting the soul with cruel delight in every new discovery of animal instincts, comes at last upon a mysterious force which can neither be decomposed nor derived from any other force, to which Freud himself gives the name of 'the censor.' 'Is it not touching, is it not sublime, that when we delve deeply enough into the human mind, even if we are only on the look-out for traces of man's animal heritage, we should always find these elements of the divine? In truth we did not need to wait for psychoanalysis to disclose the power of the faith in good and evil. But how brilliant a confirmation it is of the intuitive knowledge of former days; and at the same time how precious a testimony to the profundity of the psychoanalytic method, that psychoanalysis, after all, finds itself unable to say what Lalande once said of God, "I have no need of this hypothesis!"—but must say, on the contrary, "There is nothing more real in man than the divine power of the moral law."'

And so Dr. De MAN reaches a socialism which is not merely an economic policy but a moral ideal. 'The highest aim of scientific socialism is to become a social science in the service of the social conscience.' 'I no longer believe in the revolution as a sort of Last Judgment. But I believe all the more firmly in a revolution which will change ourselves. . . . I insist upon the need for a renovation of social conviction by means of the moral and religious consciousness. . . . I fancy that the day is not far distant when even opportunists will discover that they are throwing away their best trump when they fail to take into account the masses' need for faith.' How soon this fundamental need will reassert itself with vigour, the writer cannot tell, but he feels the outlook to be hopeful. 'Will a new spirit descend on mankind, as has happened from time to time in the course of history? This is a secret of the future, whose veil we are unable to lift. . . . For my own part, I firmly believe that there will soon be a swing of the pendulum, and that the masses will return from the materialistic cynicism which now prevails to the religious fervour which animated socialism in its early days.'

Professor PEAKE has rendered many valuable services to the Christian Church. No man in Britain has done more than he to popularize the scientific study of the Bible. He has toiled with almost incredible industry to bring the message of the Bible, as interpreted by sane and reverent

criticism, home to the mind and conscience of to-day. Both by the books he has written, and by the literary enterprises he has either initiated or controlled, he has done much to inform and influence public opinion on things Biblical and theological.

But there is another side to Dr. PEAKE. He is anything but a recluse, confined to his study or his professorial chair; he is as practical as he is scholarly, and he has long been recognized as a man whose counsel in matters affecting the life of the Church is as well worth seeking as it has long been acknowledged to be in the department of Biblical literature and criticism. One proof of this is that, in the joint negotiations which were the sequel of the now famous Lambeth Appeal, he was one of those appointed by the committee of the Federal Council of the Evangelical Free Churches to represent those Churches in their discussions with representatives of the Church of England in the joint sub-committee. Another and almost more convincing proof is his election this year to the Presidency of the National Free Church Council.

This was indeed a high honour: how well it was deserved is plain for all to see in the report of his eloquent and virile *Presidential Address* (Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, London, E.C. 4; 2d.), which we hope will be read for its admirable statement of the Protestant position, and for its peculiar timeliness in view of recent discussions in Parliament which have stirred England to its depth, and which incidentally show that, deep below the surface of what seems to be an indifference to religion as widespread as it is deplorable, the people of Great Britain not only are still essentially a religious people, but that they can be moved by religious issues as by nothing else.

There is a fine sanity about the address, and a large and tolerant sympathy towards other types of rite, creed, and organization than that with which Dr. PEAKE himself is identified. He could live and work happily, he tells us, under any form of Church order except a despotism, and so long as Episcopacy is not regarded as of the essence of the Church, he would be prepared to accept a limited form of Episcopacy, that is, one combined with elements of congregational and presbyteral order. Deploring as he does the existing divisions of Christ's Church, and willing as he would be to make certain concessions in the interests of re-union, he is, however, well aware that the general sentiment of Free Churchmen would not be in favour of reordination, even if this were 'conditional' and cast no aspersion on the validity of their previous ordination.

Next to the Lambeth Appeal, the Lausanne Conference was one of the most significant phenomena of recent times—especially significant because the Eastern Orthodox Church participated in it. Not, of course, Rome; from all such efforts at re-union Rome holds stubbornly aloof. Her aim is not re-union, but absorption; or, if in some fashion we might yet characterize her aim as re-union, it would be a re-union purchased at the price of abject submission to her, a price which no self-respecting Church would dream of consenting to pay.

In view of the 'arrogant self-confidence' of Rome, it is not surprising to find Professor PEAKE admitting that if, in the inconceivable event of his feeling obliged to transfer his ecclesiastical allegiance, he would be much more strongly drawn to the East than to Rome. Both, however, he argues, contain elements which Protestantism cannot possibly accept; and his careful and comprehensive summary of these features is one of the most valuable statements in his speech.

The sentence describing those features is important enough to be quoted in full. They include, he says, 'the doctrine of the infallibility of the Church and, in particular, of the dogmatic decrees of the Councils, the invocation of the Virgin and the saints, the change at the moment of consecration of the bread and the wine into the actual body and blood of Christ, the adoration of this Eucharistic body and blood with the same worship as is paid to the Trinity, the offering up in the

Eucharist of the body of Christ for the quick and the dead, the necessity of confession to a priest and priestly absolution, apostolic succession, the vital necessity of the episcopate to the existence of the Church, and the demand that Scripture must be interpreted in accordance with ecclesiastical tradition.' This last demand is peculiarly distasteful to men who have breathed the free spirit of scientific inquiry.

But Rome is felt to be a much more fatal obstacle than the Eastern Orthodox Church to that reunion of the Churches which many Christian people regard as the desirable and reasonable destiny of Christendom. To certain types of mind Rome no doubt makes an almost irresistible appeal—by the beauty of her services, by the assurance which she professes to bring to minds racked by doubt, by her age-long history, and in other imposing ways. But in one devastating sentence Professor PEAKE disposes of the dogma of Papal infallibility, on the truth of which 'the whole Roman position is now staked.'

Here is the sentence: 'If Matt. xvi. 18 is authentic; and if by the "rock" Peter is intended; and if the passage implies the infallibility of Peter; and if Peter ever resided in Rome; and if residing there he was its Bishop; and if he passed on his prerogatives to later Bishops of Rome; and if he did not pass them on to the Bishops in other places where he resided; if indeed there was any monarchical episcopate in Rome till decades after his time; and if the explicit utterances of Jesus did not forbid such a claim; and if it were not incompatible with much in the New Testament record—then and only then could one concede the Roman claim.' And the value of the dogma is, after all, little more than 'very effective window-dressing.'

But Professor PEAKE touches issues which are much more vital when he comes to deal with the relation of the Free Churches to the Church of England, the relation of the Church to the State, and indirectly with the ecclesiastical problems which are agitating the country at the present moment. His whole argument is coloured by his high conception of the nature and function of the Church.

Without in the very least depreciating the ministry, he maintains that 'the ministry has nothing which the whole body does not possess.' If the ministry has a prophetic and priestly character it is only because this character is already inherent in the Church, and the grace which the minister may claim is in no way different from the grace which may be confidently claimed by and bestowed upon the humblest of the Church's members and workers. No hard-and-fast line divides clergy and laity.

On the question of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament of Holy Communion Professor PEAKE takes up a position which is representative of the attitude of the Free Churches. He believes as firmly as any Roman Catholic in the Real Presence; but that Presence, he adds, must be more spiritually interpreted, and 'it ought not to be regarded as different in kind from that which the Christian experiences in prayer and other acts of devotion.' No change takes place in the elements themselves.

Dearly as we love the Church, we must all sorrowfully admit that she is nothing like the potent force for good that she should be and could be; and Professor PEAKE concludes his address by directing his hearers to her fundamental weakness and the remedy. The real trouble with the Church, he says, is anæmia, the 'thinness and poorness' of her spiritual life; and the real remedy is her right adjustment to God. We must recapture that fear of God which from some types of religious and ecclesiastical life has all but vanished, but which happily some theological thinkers are beginning to re-emphasize, and which can best be recovered and nourished by a deeper acquaintance with, and a fresh appreciation of the Bible which, with its revelation of God and its story of Jesus, remains our 'indispensable means of grace.' Its prevalent neglect sufficiently explains the decadence of the Church, in so far as she may justly be called decadent, and the frank and loving study of it would open for the Church once more the flood-gates of power and blessing.

The Sermon on the Mount.

Judgment of Others (Mt. vii. 1–5).

By the Reverend James Reid, M.A., Eastbourne.

This is one of the most startling and challenging of all the injunctions of Jesus. There is no doubt that here He touches most of us in one of the weak spots in our life—our habit of judging others.

The trouble, however, when we sit down to think it out, is that He is asking something of us which does not immediately appeal to our moral sense as being right. It is easy enough to understand how His words applied to the Pharisees of His own time. They had developed the critical habit into a fine art. Judgment of others was part of their stock-in-trade. As Dr. Gore says: 'They had almost come to test their moral progress by the capacity to judge other people.' The result was that the world in which they lived was strewn with the débris of their fiery denunciations. The streets of Palestine were filled with people who were regarded as being outside the pale of religious hope—publicans and sinners, moral outcasts, condemned by the attitude of these very religious and superior people to moral despair. It was an atmosphere in which no weak or broken soul could rise into the light of a new day. It is easy enough to understand how Jesus could enjoin them to give up this censorious temper towards their fellows; especially when we remember that the standards by which they judged others were not the standards of the goodness of Jesus Christ, but the standards of a morality which was artificial and often mere matter of form. Imagine the state of mind which could make a spiritual outcast of a man for doing a deed of kindness to his fellow on the Sabbath day, although there was no objection made to his saving his ox or his ass on the same day; or which judged a man as a kind of heathen because he happened to eat his food without first washing his hands. It was high time that people who lived in that kind of topsy-turvy moral world should give up the habit of making judgments about other people. For quite obviously they were generally wrong, and to be condemned by the Pharisees might be—as in the case of Jesus Himself—the highest compliment.

But surely in our case, especially now that the light of Christ is up in the sky and He has taught us something of what real goodness is, He cannot mean that we are never to judge. I am quite sure He does not mean that we are not to have a discernment of what is right and wrong and to exercise it. There are actions which are plainly and palpably wrong, and it is only honesty to say so. Murder is wrong, and theft is wrong, and adultery is wrong—wherever we find them. And Christ would not have us trifle with moral distinctions, or try, as some do, to blind our own eyes and the eyes of others by excuses. It is part of our plain duty in days like these, when moral distinctions are apt to be blurred in the interests of what is pleasant and flattering to the senses, to call evil things by their right names. And many a man has found the first step into salvation when the mist has been blown from his eyes by the east wind of truth, and he has seen his sin for what it is and shuddered at it, so that by the shudder his chains were loosed. Whatever we may do with regard to people, we must exercise moral judgment with regard to their actions. It is part of what Christ means by 'walking in the light.'

Further: are there not occasions when we *must* judge people? Surely there are times when we are obliged to discriminate. An employer must learn to be a good judge of men, and must exercise such judgment in his business. He must know the people whom he can trust to do a certain bit of work, and those whom he cannot. A philanthropist must be able to judge others and must exercise his judgment if he is to help them. It would be folly to make things easy for some people by giving them money, for instance; and in other cases it would be wrong to refuse to give. When a woman chooses a husband, or a man a wife, or any one a friend, it would be wrong not to exercise moral judgment; it would be sheer folly. Half the tragedies of life are due to moral blindness in this direction, where the eye is caught by some surface attraction which soon wears thin and reveals the rags of selfishness or some other form of tragic weakness. Yet Jesus says, 'Judge not, that ye be not judged.' What does He mean?

I.

His meaning must be found in the whole spirit of His teaching about *our attitude to other people.*

That is what He is concerned with—not what we may think of people or of what they have done, but the attitude which we allow ourselves to take. He had just said that we are to keep the attitude of love to all men without discrimination. We are even to love our enemies. We are to do good to them that hate us. We are, that is to say, to value them as men and women with spiritual capacities which it is our business to help them to realize and develop. We are to bear ourselves to every one whatever they are, and especially to those who most need our help, in the attitude which will help them to become better men and women—to become their true selves. That is His view of true justice — giving people their due. Their due is not that which in our judgment they deserve by way of punishment or retribution; their due is what they need in order to become their true selves. Christ's point of view is always constructive, always redeeming. That, He tells us constantly, is the attitude of God. He knows us through and through, the good and the evil in us, and yet He does not let His judgment of our character affect His attitude to us or keep Him from giving us what we need. His gifts to us are not dependent on our deserts, else which of us would have the things we have. 'He sendeth His rain on the good and on the evil, and maketh His sun to shine on the just and the unjust.' The point is, surely, that we are not to carry the attitude of condemnation; that we are not to denounce people, or to look for the worst in them and fix our minds upon it so that it affects our outlook and dams up our love. We are to let nothing they have done stand between us and the friendliness and understanding that would enable them to become better than they are. If we criticise, we are to criticise in love, and as a doctor would mark in a patient a symptom of disease for the purpose of helping the man to a cure, but without the censorious attitude of blame or reprobation. This is surely the general sense of what Christ means when he says, 'Judge not, that ye be not judged.'

II.

But when we see that, I think we shall see more, and deeper. We shall be very chary even of making up our minds about people, about criticising them at all, unless it can obviously serve the purpose of helping them. And that will cut out a good deal of the criticism which is so common a habit with some people that it almost becomes a pastime.

There are various reasons for withholding judgment. For one thing, we do not know enough about people to judge them or blame them. Some one says, 'To know all is to forgive all.' This may be too sweeping. But it conveys a caution. We know so little of what goes on inside that strange box of tricks which we call the mind. We are learning a good deal about it in these days from the study of psychology; and the staggering thing that comes to light is that many people who do wrong things are all the time under the influence of some unconscious motive, struggling with some hidden fear or shame, some antipathy which keeps them blind or which produces conflicts that break out in abnormal conduct. The real motives of action are hidden from us. Twenty years ago children who stole or broke some other law of society were sent to prison, in many cases with disastrous consequences to their whole career. To-day we should send them to a psychologist. A good deal of our criminal procedure has resulted in the manufacture of criminals. A well-known doctor, speaking of conduct, says that from his intimate knowledge of the human body he has learned in judgment to preserve 'a physiological charity.' Many of us to-day are learning to keep in our judgments a psychological charity. Here is a man, for instance, who has an intolerable temper, a boorish spirit. But dig down, and you will find that in his boyhood he suffered cruelly from something, either physical or mental, which gave him a deep resentment against life, or which drove him to make up for a sense of inferiority by forcing other people to take notice of him. There are all kinds of queer kinks about most of us. We are all differently made—and perhaps marred. Some people carry a furnace of passion within them with which they have never been taught how to deal, so that even to keep decent involves a miracle of self-control; while others, who know little of these temptations, find vice only repulsive. The plea of Burns for charity in judgment is a commonplace, but it rings true, from the side of one who had suffered, to the teaching of Jesus.

> Who made the heart, 'tis He alone
> Decidedly can try us;
> He knows each chord, its various tone,
> Each spring, its various bias.
> Then at the balance let's be mute,
> We never can adjust it;
> What's done we partly may compute,
> But know not what's resisted.

The last thing we dare do is to judge motives

that is the last iniquity. To impute a base motive to a man for some conduct that is bad, is bad enough; but to impute a base motive for some conduct that is good is to poison the very wells of social intercourse. It was the sin of sins which the men of His day committed against Jesus Christ. When they could not dispute the beauty of His healing ministry they threw mud at His motives. They said, 'He casteth out devils by Beelzebub the prince of the devils,' and thereby they went very near to blinding their own souls, putting out the light of conscience and making it for ever impossible for themselves to see good and evil. 'Judge not,' said Jesus, 'that ye be not judged.'

But again: we do not know, because our own judgment may be biassed. We may not see clearly, because we may have a beam in our own eye. There are judgments of others which proceed from the desire to exalt ourselves, to pat ourselves on the back, or to hide from ourselves and from the judgment of the light some failing of our own. Samuel Butler was right when in his sardonic wit he spoke of people who

> Compound for sins they are inclined to,
> By damning those they have no mind to.

It is very subtle. Our own moral problem, for instance, may be temper or something of that nature; and one result of it is that we are apt to be very hard on the man who is lazy or who gives way to drink. Our judgment is a form of self-excuse. We all know the formula—'I may have my faults, but at least I do not do so-and-so'—the very formula of the Pharisee in the Temple on whom Christ flung so lurid a light. Or again, we may misjudge because our attitude to the person we are judging is not right, and we therefore do not see straight. How is it that there are people who in our eyes can hardly do any wrong, whilst there are others of whom our judgment is harsh to the point of bitterness, so that in our eyes they can hardly do anything right? It is because our inner attitude is wrong; we are moved by personal bias. It may not be against them, but it may be against the type for which they stand. It may be because some one like them once did us an injury, and the thought of it slumbers there in the mind and poisons everything.

> I do not love thee, Doctor Fell;
> The reason why I cannot tell,
> But this I know, and know full well,
> I do not love thee, Doctor Fell.

There are people who think it is a kind of virtue to dislike others instinctively. They presume that something must be wrong with the people whom they dislike. They pride themselves on their moral discernment. But it does not follow that our instinct is right. The most dangerous thing in the world is to give way to this instinctive dislike of people. It is often the result of unconscious prejudice. It may be that the reason we dislike them is because somehow they touch some secret sore spot, revive some unpleasant memory, affect our position in some way or other, touch our pride or jealousy or some other mean thing which twists our whole outlook. Is not this what Jesus means by suggesting that we should first take the beam out of our own eye and then we shall see clearly to take the mote out of our brother's eye? And surely if we begin that process of self-examination and get to work on ourselves we shall probably find so much to do that we shall have little time to give to the criticism of others.

III.

But there are other reasons why Christ bids us not judge, or if there is something which we know is wrong forbids us to condemn or to denounce, or let the critical spirit affect our attitude of love and understanding. It is bad for ourselves. 'Judge not, that ye be not judged.' It ministers to our own pride and superiority. It blinds our eyes to our own defects. And further, it shows up our own character. The judgment of others has the power of self-revelation. Think of what a man usually condemns and the kind of people he usually condemns, and you will have a real picture of the kind of man he is himself. There never was any judgment-seat like the one set up to try Jesus, or the Cross set up to crucify Him. But it was not He who was being judged; it was the Pharisees. And the Cross not only shows the kind of man Jesus was; it shows just as clearly the kind of men they were who crucified Him. It is enough that they have gone down to history as the people who crucified Jesus, and the world has hardly ever been able to tolerate the name of Pharisee from that day to this. A man often condemns others because they are secretly condemning him. His judgment of them is his own condemnation of himself.

But what this warning probably means, most of all, is that the censorious attitude produces a critical atmosphere in which we who judge come in for our full share of criticism. It poisons the air which we ourselves have to breathe. It reacts upon ourselves. There is nothing surer than that

if we are in the habit of criticising other people, holding up their weaknesses to the light, they will also be criticising us. And what a world that is to live in! It is like soil that has been poisoned by some corrosive acid in which nothing beautiful will grow. It is a miserable world that a man makes for himself as well as for others who is always on the outlook for the worst instead of the best—a world in which there is no faith in humanity, nothing to love, nothing to inspire, nothing to give us the sense of God. For let us remember, we inhabit the kind of world which is made up of the kind of things we select and fix our minds upon. God help the man who has so cultivated his critical faculty that he sees only weakness and failure and crookedness in other people. He is making his bed in hell. And what is more, he *creates* that kind of world by his outlook and attitude; for people react to us in the way in which we meet them. The man who is looking for goodness takes with him the spirit which has the power to create that goodness. He finds it because his expectation produces it. Think of the world which Jesus created for Himself. What unexpected jewels of goodness He found in all sorts of people in whom others saw nothing but evil—in foreigners, in outcasts, in publicans, in women who were lost to self-respect and decency. For in these, by His very faith and charity, He created goodness where there was only its germ before, and awoke a love and reverence in hearts that had been trampled in the mud of human passion. And how they stood by Him! There are people in whose company we know we can become our best. All that is good in us awakes like flowers in sunlight. But there are people in whose very presence, because they are on the outlook for failure and weakness, all that is worst comes to the surface and all that is noble and generous is withered and dried up. 'Whatever you do,' says Jesus in effect, 'carry to the world in which you live the spirit of charity and love and understanding; for by the spirit which you take into life, you are shaping the world in which you yourself will have to live.'

IV.

And that brings us to the main reason for not judging. It is just this, that condemnation is futile to change men's hearts. Condemnation may scorch; it can never heal. It may destroy, it can never create. It may blast, it can never redeem. It may make people hate us and perhaps hate themselves, it can never awaken that hope and faith and courage in which men can rise out of their evil selves. That is why Jesus never condemned. Even when He denounced the scribes and Pharisees, it was more like a wail of sorrow, a moan of regret, than a flame of reproach. The picture of Christ condemning the Pharisees must never be looked at apart from the background of tenderness and heart-breaking love which leaps into view in His weeping over Jerusalem. And it is worth noting that even here the thing which He did denounce was just that judging, critical spirit which made the Pharisees blind to their own defects and blind to the goodness of others. 'I am not come to destroy,' He said, 'but to fulfil.' He did not quench the smoking flax, nor break the bruised reed. 'The Son of man,' He said, 'is not come to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved.'

That does not mean that evil is not to be judged. Evil *is* judged; but the only true judgment, the judgment which is redeeming and which brings to a real repentance, is the judgment of a goodness and love which penetrates by its own beauty and which makes people feel ashamed and at the same time lifts them up. No external judgment is morally redeeming that does not awaken self-judgment, and the chief effect of condemnation is to awaken the defensive mood—while it creates the atmosphere of moral despair. The lives that bring us to repentance and awaken a real sorrow for sin are the lives which by their own goodness and love hold up a mirror to ours so that in their light we see what we are. We need not fear that evil will lack reproof so long as there are people in the world who love like Jesus. If our lives have the spirit of Jesus they will become a kind of judgment throne. They will make men feel what sin is without saying a word about it. They will unveil selfishness without a word of condemnation. Nay, the very power of goodness is just in its silence. Think of Christ before His accusers. Think of Him on the Cross. 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' And He meant what He said. And yet, while He will not condemn, does He not judge in His whole spirit and forgiveness? Jesus judges us by being what He is, by a love from which there is no shelter.

> Thou judgest us; Thy purity
> Doth all our lusts condemn;
> The love that draws us nearer Thee
> Is hot with wrath to them.

Judgment is effective only when it is of love—the love that seeks to redeem, the love that beareth

all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things. And that kind of love is never critical; its very silence and charity are its power. It all comes back to this, does it not, whether we love people enough to love them *in* their weakness that we may love them *out of* their weakness. 'Let your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven.'

The Gospel according to the Hebrews.

By the Reverend Roderic Dunkerley, B.A., B.D., Ph.D., Gloucester.

II.

(2) 'And it came to pass when the Lord had come up from the water, the entire fountain of the Holy Spirit descended and rested upon him, and said to him, "My Son, in all the prophets did I await thee, that thou mightest come and I might rest in thee. For thou art my rest; thou art my first-born son, that reignest for ever."' [1]

Here, too, I agree with Holtzmann,[2] Menzies,[3] and others in thinking this has much more the appearance and tone of a real communication made by Jesus to His friends than of a mere invention. My chief reason is that the words accord well with the view suggested above of the spiritual development of Jesus; as Menzies puts it: 'Here more distinctly than in any of the canonical Gospels, the baptism is the act by which Jesus is made acquainted with His destiny to bring about the highest revelation of God.' We should notice the words—'said to him'; there is no such explicit statement in the Synoptics that the voice was to and for Him, not the bystanders. That may be gathered from the form of address in Mark and Luke ('Thou art . . .'), but in Matthew the third person is employed, and the only hint (αὐτῷ—a few lines higher up) that the experience was not a publicly evident one is removed by ℵ, B, and other authorities. It is very difficult to think that this, the most personal and intimate of the accounts, is secondary to and a development from the Matthew version, the most public and spectacular.

Further, it must not be forgotten that it is almost certainly due to Jesus Himself that we have any account of the matter at all; we are reading His spiritual autobiography, so to speak. It is surely quite credible, then, that Jesus would tell His disciples of this great crisis on more than one occasion, and not in exactly the same form of words. There is still another version found in the Ebionite Gospel and in certain MSS. of Luke, which Streeter and others accept as the original reading there.[4] May not these variant accounts be regarded as all but partially successful attempts to declare the wonder of the illumination that came to Him then?[5] Again, it should be noticed that Jerome cites this passage from 'Hebrews' when expounding Is 11[2], and the connexion is obvious; it seems very natural to think of Jesus both having this prophecy in mind during His baptism and expressing His experience thus when He narrated the incident.

Findlay's estimate of the passage appears to me strange. On the one hand, he thinks it finely expresses the unity of revelation in the Hebrew religion and Christianity—there is a striking harmony between it and the opening verses of the 'Epistle to the Hebrews'—and, further, that it helps us to realize more clearly than do the canonical Gospels how 'the baptism meant for Jesus the rise into clear consciousness of the conviction of His Messianic vocation and His supernatural endowment for it.'[6] Yet, on the other hand, he does not so much as discuss the possibility that a genuine reminiscence may be embedded here, and quite evidently does not consider the passage in any way based on early and reliable tradition. For the reasons just outlined this seems to me quite unsatisfactory. Moreover, his remark that the phrase 'the Lord' in descriptive narrative is a sign of late date is surely beside the mark; many

[1] Jerome, *Comm. on Isaiah*, at 11[2].

[2] *Op. cit.* p. 47.

[3] *Op. cit.* pp. 341–2.

[4] *Op. cit.* pp. 143, 276; cp. Harnack, *The Sayings of Jesus*, p. 310 f., and Moffatt's translation of the N.T., at Lk 3[22].

[5] J. Middleton Murry, in his recent *Life of Jesus* also argues thus (pp. 30–34).

[6] *Op. cit.* pp. 70 f.

particular words may have been altered, and yet the essential authenticity of the passage as a whole remain.

(3) 'Just now my mother the Holy Spirit took me by one of my hairs, and carried me off to the great mountain Tabor.' [1]

Regarding this, I have elsewhere thrown out the suggestion that the words 'my mother' are vocative, not nominative in apposition.[2] Read thus, it looks like a boyish remark of Jesus', which might well have found a place amongst the reminiscences of James. This explanation of it has the merit of removing it altogether from the Temptation story, to which it is usually assumed to have belonged; as I have pointed out, there seem great objections to thinking that it was so connected. But I will not argue the case for this idea here, merely remarking that I am not prepared to defend it to the last ditch if good reasons can be given against it; so far, however, I have not observed any refutation of it. My previously expressed view of the Hebrew Gospel needs correcting by what has been written in the present article.

(4) '"If thy brother," he saith, "have sinned in word and given thee satisfaction, seven times in a day receive him." Simon his disciple said unto him, "Seven times in a day?" The Lord answered and said unto him, "Yea, I say unto thee, unto seventy times seven. For with the prophets also after they were anointed with the Holy Spirit, there was found sinful speech."' [3]

This is the passage which, Burkitt considers (as mentioned above), 'bears all the marks of superior originality to the parallels in Mt $18^{21.\ 22}$ and Lk $17^{3.\ 4}$.' [4] Holtzmann also takes this view, saying: 'Here not only is the opening of the incident more natural than in Matthew; the admonition of Jesus, the astonishment of Simon, and the heightening of the admonition which Simon's exclamation calls forth, as also the justification which is offered for it, are all admirably in harmony with the earnest character of Jesus' preaching (cf. Mk 10^{18}). And how free, again, is the deeply serious observation as to the language of the Prophets! A later writer would not have put such a saying into the mouth of Jesus.' [5] Findlay does not deal with this fragment, but Evelyn White [6] calls attention to the similarity in style between it and a passage in 2 Clement. In each the teaching is bisected by a leading question, and White thinks that this 'peculiar rhetorical structure . . . is intended to relieve the monologue by introducing a kind of dramatic variety,' and that 'there is not the least doubt such dramatic presentations of sayings are later than their canonical versions.' But there are several reasons for questioning this reading of the evidence. First of all, Matthew also attributes a query to Peter, though in a rather different form; and there seems every likelihood both that such questions would be put to Jesus and that it would be remembered that such and such a teaching was developed as a result. Again, if the last clause here is historical—as on other grounds, I think it is—that fact would considerably increase the probability that the whole passage is based on sound memory, and it is strange that White entirely ignores this agraphon. Moreover, his contention is very closely connected with his ingenious but far-fetched interpretation of one of the Oxyrhynchus sayings; [7] without the very doubtful support of the hypothetical context which he provides for that saying, his argument would lack substance. Nor, so far as I am aware, are there any other instances in patristic literature of such 'rhetorical structure' to lend colour to his idea.

As regards the closing agraphon, surely Holtzmann is right in saying that we can hardly imagine a later writer fabricating it, especially, it may be added, one who included such a reference to the prophets as we have already noticed, in the second of these passages. The idea that they were 'anointed with the Holy Spirit' occurs in Is 61^{1}; but the 'cursing psalms' and parallel passages in the prophetic books are sufficient to demonstrate the truth of the observation attributed here to Jesus. The aptness of it in the present context is evident; Westcott [8] and Griffinhoofe [9] call it 'obscure,' but surely it is clear enough—sanctification is a process, and when others do not grow in grace as speedily as we might wish, we are to be gentle with them (1 Th 2^{7}), not break the bruised reed (Mt 12^{20}), but rather forgive many times; if

[1] Origen, *Comm. on John*, vol. ii. ch. vi.; for four other references, see Resch, pp. 216, 238.

[2] The Expository Times, August 1925, and *The Unwritten Gospel*, p. 33.

[3] Jerome, *Against Pelag.*, iii. 2.

[4] *The Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 342.

[5] *Op. cit.* p. 49.

[6] *Op. cit.* p. 20; he mentions Handmann as thinking this version more primitive than its canonical parallels.

[7] *O.P.* 654^{1}.

[8] *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, App. C.

[9] *The Unwritten Sayings of Christ*, p. 23.

even the prophets erred often, how much more are those with whom we have to do likely to require repeated restoration? One other point: Nicholson suggests that 'in word' is a mistranslation of Jerome's, and that the original Hebrew meant 'in anything.'[1] James takes the same view, rendering also the final words 'somewhat of sin.'[2] This, of course, eliminates from the passage one of its peculiar features, and is, I believe, an error. Jerome quotes the passage in close connexion with the first passage considered here because of the idea in both of sinful utterance. We may remark that it is commonly thought that the Epistle of James contains many echoes of the teaching of Jesus, and its stress on 'bridling the tongue' (3^{1-12}) is like the obverse and complement of this passage.

(5) 'The other of the rich men said unto him, "Master, what good thing shall I do to live?" He said to him: "Man, do the law and the prophets." He answered unto Him: "I have." He said to him: "Go, sell all that thou hast, and distribute to the poor, and come, follow me." But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it pleased him not. And the Lord said unto him: "How sayest thou, I have done the law and the prophets, since it is written in the law, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself; and behold, many brethren of thine, sons of Abraham, are clad in filth, dying of hunger, and thy house is full of good things, and nothing at all goes out from it to them?" And he turned and said to Simon, his disciple, who was sitting by him: "Simon, son of John, it is easier for a camel to enter through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven."'

It is doubtful on whose authority this comes to us as an extract from 'Hebrews.' It occurs only in the Latin translation of Origen's *Commentary on Matthew*,[3] not in the extant Greek text, and it is often thought to have been added by the translator, presumably from Jerome. But, of course, this doubt as to the transmission of the story does not mean that it was not in 'Hebrews,' nor does it touch the question of its possible originality.

Very different views have been held concerning it. While a few writers (Baring-Gould,[4] Griffinhoofe[5]) regard it as a more primitive version of the Synoptic story, chiefly because of its several realistic touches, the more usual judgment is that it is dependent upon that and distinctly secondary. Before arguing positively in favour of the third possibility—that a separate but similar incident is here reported—there are several reasons which I would briefly mention why the second of these views appears unsatisfactory. (1) Evelyn White calls attention to six phrases which he thinks are reminiscent of the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus.[6] But the parallels are not really at all close—there is practically no verbal agreement; and if the writer of 'Hebrews' were thus employing Luke it is difficult to see why he did not use much more. Further, there are other ways in which the slight similarities might have arisen; in particular, if the incident took place much as we have it narrated here, Jesus might quite conceivably have made it the background so to speak for a story of selfish indifference, as on other occasions He probably framed His illustrations from actual events. (2) Burkitt stresses the agreement of 'Hebrews' with Matthew in the form of the question put to Jesus, 'Master, what good thing shall I do?' which avoids an awkward problem, and is, he says, 'certainly not primitive.'[7] But should we not notice also the conclusion of the sentence, in which this Gospel differs from Matthew, '. . . to live,' instead of '. . . that I may have eternal life'? The phrases are certainly synonymous on the lips of Jesus (Lk $10^{25.\ 28}$), but is there any evidence that 'life' and 'live' had this absolute sense before He so used them? 'Quid bonum faciens vivam?' certainly has the appearance of being merely the very natural query, 'How can I live a life of doing good?' If that was the significance of the question, is it not possible that Matthew's form is a conflation of Mark's and the one before us? (3) Findlay's great point is that the story has been re-told thus to eliminate certain points to which objection was taken and to mitigate the severity of Christ's words by showing that the man had in reality been living a selfish life, whereas in the Synoptic narrative the point is simply that at that particular crisis the man was unfit because he would not sacrifice.[8] I feel this is unsatisfactory; it is out of harmony with what follows, where the reference (Mk 10^{23}) is obviously to *all* those 'that have riches.' There was no greater crisis or call for sacrifice then than at all times; the challenge is inherent in the Golden Rule and is of the very essence of the Gospel. I have argued

[1] *Op. cit.* p. 48.
[2] *The Apocryphal New Testament*, p. 6.
[3] Bk. xv. ch. xiv.
[4] *The Lost and Hostile Gospels*, p. 141.
[5] *Op. cit.* p. 24.
[6] *Op. cit.* p. lvi.
[7] *Op. cit.* p. 346.
[8] *Op. cit.* p. 77.

this more fully elsewhere, so I will not develop the idea now.[1]

More positively, I would call attention to the several hints in the story which show that it was told in 'Hebrews' as a different event, not as a rival and professedly superior account of the same incident as the Synoptics report. This fact has been very commonly missed; Findlay definitely speaks of it as a 'version' of the other, and Glover says: 'We need not altogether reject this variant of the story.'[2] But surely the phrase, 'The *other* of the rich men' belongs to the extract and is not part of Origen's comment (or that of the translator), which implies either that the familiar story had already found a place in the narrative, or at least that it was acknowledged there as a separate incident. This is also suggested by the reference to Simon's sitting posture which indicates quite another context from that in the Gospels, for Mk 10^{17} tells us that the incident happened 'as he was going forth into the way.' But if it were given not as an alternative but as a different happening altogether, the case for a purposed manipulation of the story falls to the ground, since the objectionable features remained in the original tale unchallenged. Nor is it at all impossible that partially similar incidents should occur, and if they did so, it is easy to see why one story was commonly omitted.

> (6) 'And when the Lord had given his linen cloth to the servant of the priest, he went to James and appeared unto him. For James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour wherein the Lord had drunk the cup until he saw him rising from the dead. "Bring a table and bread," saith the Lord. He took up the bread and blessed and broke, and afterwards gave to James the Just, and said to him: "My brother, eat thy bread, for the Son of man is risen from them that sleep."'[3]

That Jesus appeared to James is, of course, stated by Paul (1 Co 15^{7}), and many scholars regard this account of what happened as substantially accurate. Burkitt calls it an 'impressive story';[4] Mayor says: 'There is, I think, a ring of genuineness about the narrative . . . an originality and simplicity which is not unworthy of the genuine Gospels themselves.'[5] Menzies considers that while there are embellishing touches of a later time, 'the tradition itself has a look of originality and is independent of our N.T.'[6] Nicholson,[7] Plumptre,[8] Griffinhoofe,[9] and Blomfield Jackson[10] all accept it as historical. On the other hand, Resch[11] and Ropes[12] reject it, and Findlay is of opinion that several points in the story indicate a later date than the Gospels.[13] He refers especially to the statement that this was the first resurrection appearance, which not only conflicts with the canonical evidence, but hints at a Jewish-Christian bias in favour of the head of the Jerusalem Church, and to the handing of the shroud to the priest's servant. But he does not appear to see that these and other things may be the 'embellishing touches of a later time' of which Menzies speaks, and yet the story itself be essentially true. As regards James' oath, which does belong more to the heart of the matter, he says it is 'obviously not genuine, but is designed, in the Jewish-Christian interest, to shew James was a believer before Christ died.' He advances no argument on the point, however, which can hardly be called proved; something must have happened to win James into the circle of believers, and it is not impossible that this was his picturesque way of narrating how conviction of sin and gloom of spirit were resolved by a gracious manifestation.

I accept the reading 'wherein the Lord had drunk the cup,' where the reference, of course, is to His death (Mt 20^{22} 26^{39}), with the only Greek translation of Jerome, which is followed by Lightfoot,[14] Menzies, Jackson, and Findlay. A form of the story in two sixth-century books also favours this reading, for they speak of the vow having been made at the crucifixion. On the other hand, all the Latin copies of Jerome say, 'wherein he had drunk the cup of the Lord,' referring to the Last Supper, and Nicholson considers this evidence unimpeachable. But this implies that others were present at the Last Supper in addition to the Twelve—an unlikely suggestion.

One small point that has an authentic sound about it is the phrase 'the Son of man'; it was very commonly used by Jesus Himself of Himself, but only occurs twice elsewhere in the N.T. (Ac 7^{56}, Rev 1^{13}), and its presence here when the Early Church so evidently refrained from employing it is noteworthy.

[1] *The Unwritten Gospel*, ch. xviii.
[2] *The Jesus of History*, p. 122.
[3] Jerome, *Concerning Illustrious Men*, 2.
[4] *Op. cit.* p. 347.
[5] *Comm. on James*,[3] p. lvi.
[6] *HDB* v. p. 342.
[7] *Op. cit.* p. 63 f.
[8] *Comm. on James*, Introd. p. 22.
[9] *The Unwritten Sayings of Christ*, p. 29.
[10] *Twenty-five Agrapha*, p. 55.
[11] *Agrapha*,[2] p. 249.
[12] *Die Sprüche Jesu*, p. 168.
[13] *Op. cit.* p. 76.
[14] *Comm. on Galatians*, p. 266.

(7) 'And when he came to Peter and those about him, he said to them: "Take, feel me, and see that I am not a bodiless devil." And straightway they touched him and believed.'

This is the passage referred to above which Ignatius[1] quotes without stating his authority, and Jerome says was taken from 'Hebrews.'[2] If this is correct, it is very early witness to this Gospel; but, of course, it is possible, and perhaps more likely, that Ignatius drew it from M. Jerome implies that it was not an unrecorded appearance, but an alternative account of that told in Lk 24^{36-39}; this may, I think, be accepted—but it is inadequate to assume without argument (as White does[3]) that there is some literary connexion and that the canonical version is the earlier. Stanton's view is that 'the phraseology is markedly different both from that of this passage (in Luke) and of the canonical Gospels generally,' and he suggests that the story passed from oral tradition into 'Hebrews' independently of Luke.[4] We may remember that there is no proof that all Luke's peculiar matter came from a single source, and also that he may well have been in touch with M either in oral or in written form when at Jerusalem with Paul (Ac $21^{17.\ 18}$). There is, at least, one point in which if there is a dependence Luke's seems the later. He has 'spirit' instead of 'bodiless devil,' and the latter is surely the more difficult expression, which it would be quite in Luke's manner to soften down. This point is missed if we translate *δαιμόνιον ἀσώματον*, 'bodiless spirit,' as many have done; Nicholson says that phrase is 'doubtless more elegant, but entirely opposed to the usage of the N.T. and Christian writers,' and he rightly suggests that this is to lose the point of the remark, since the disciples were frightened because they thought it was an appearance boding *evil*.[5]

(8) 'Never rejoice, except when you have looked upon your brother in love.'[6]

(9) It is said that this Gospel placed 'among the greatest sins, if a man have grieved the spirit of his brother.'[7]

These are the two agrapha before mentioned which appear to me to harmonize strikingly with the tone of the Epistle of James, and to be exactly the kind of saying that we should imagine would be lovingly cherished in the circle that gave birth to that writing. They have been commonly accepted as genuine, even Findlay considering they have historical worth, though not perhaps preserving the *ipsissima verba* of Christ.[8]

(10) 'I will select to myself the good, those good ones whom my father in heaven has given me.'[9]

(11) 'He who wonders shall reign, and he who reigns shall rest.'[10]

Of these it must suffice to say that the first has been thought genuine by many writers,[11] while the second in its longer form is found amongst the Oxyrhynchus agrapha, which, I believe, include early and valuable elements. I have argued elsewhere that both accord well with various passages in the canonical Gospels.[12]

In addition to these passages which all contain sayings of Jesus that may well be authentic, there are several points in others of the extant fragments of 'Hebrews' which perhaps preserve accurate information. It is evident that, if they are reliable, the probability is enhanced that the work which retained them was a primitive document worthy of respect.

(12) At Mt 4^5, 'Jerusalem' was found in this Gospel instead of 'the holy city.'[13] It is strange that 'Hebrews' should agree here with Luke as against Matthew, especially in view of the fact that the descriptive title was common amongst the Jewish Christians (as McNeile tells us[14]), and that from them it passed to the Arabs who still call Jerusalem *el-Ḳuds* ('the holy'). We may, of course, simply say that 'Hebrews' is secondary and borrowed from Luke here, but this does not explain why this happened. And it is certainly possible that both Luke and 'Hebrews' at this point retain the original form of Q; it must be remembered that the story of the temptation must have formed part of Christ's instruction to His disciples, and it seems likely that he would use the proper name (cf. Mk 10^{33}, Lk 13^{33}).

(13) At Mt 6^{11}, the word *mahar* (*i.e.* 'of the morrow') was found for *ἐπιούσιον*.[15] The argument of Nestle appears to me to be sound that this must be primitive, even if the Gospel was a transla-

[1] *Epistle to the Smyrneans*, 3.
[2] Jerome, *op. cit.* p. 16.
[3] *Op. cit.* p. lviii.
[4] *Op. cit.* p. 14.
[5] *Op. cit.* p. 74.
[6] Jerome, *Comm. on Ephesians*, at v. 4.
[7] Jerome, *Comm. on Ezekiel*, xviii. 7.
[8] *Op. cit.* p. 74.
[9] Eusebius, *Theophania*, iv. 12.
[10] Clement (Alex.), *Miscellanies*, i. 9; a longer form is found at v. 14, but not there actually attributed to this Gospel.
[11] Nicholson, Westcott, Ropes, Blomfield Jackson, and Holtzmann, etc.
[12] *The Unwritten Gospel*, pp. 173, 48.
[13] See scholion in Codex 566.
[14] *Comm. on Matt.* p. 39.
[15] Jerome, *Comm. on Matt.*, loc. cit.

tion from the Greek; for it is impossible to think of a translator rejecting the form of the prayer to which he and his readers were accustomed, and there is every probability that among Jewish Christians the original form of the prayer would be retained.[1] Holtzmann thinks that 'there can be no question that this was the original word.'[2] This view agrees well with the now generally accepted derivation of ἐπιούσιος from ἐπιοῦσα (see Lightfoot's famous discussion[3]). I am inclined to wonder whether the apparent contradiction between this word and the teaching of Mt 6[34] may not be due to an ambiguity in *mahar*, as in the English phrase 'the coming day,' which may either mean strictly 'to-morrow' or 'the day that has now commenced.' If it could be used in this way, the prayer would be a perfectly natural one either at morning or evening, especially amongst the Jews for whom sunset marked the start of the new day. Might not this also account for—what is a commonly felt difficulty—the choice of this strange Greek expression when εἰς τὴν αὔριον was ready at hand? May it not have been an attempt to resolve the ambiguity?

(14) The man whose hand was withered appealed thus to Jesus: 'I was a mason seeking a livelihood with my hands: I pray thee, Jesus, restore to me health, that I may not shamefully beg my food.'[4] Stanton quotes Harnack as accepting this because of its vividness; he himself, however, thinks it a sign of legendary accretion.[5] But it may be asked, if the latter view is correct, why is the embellishment so mild?—should we not have expected at least the man's name to be added? How is it, moreover, that similar details were not given about other characters in the Gospels; for, had they been so, would not Jerome have probably cited them?

(15) Jerome states: 'In the Gospel I so often mention we read that a lintel of the temple of immense size was broken and divided.'[6] It is strange that a division of opinion exists as to whether this is a simpler or a more extraordinary form of the story than the rending of the veil. Resch said that it 'shows a decidedly apocryphal predilection for the miraculous';[7] but Nestle poured scorn upon this statement and maintained that 'the very opposite is true,' and that this narrative is much more what we should expect to happen during an earthquake shock.[8] Findlay takes the opposite view, that the Matthean narrative has been altered, possibly 'to heighten the effect,' but advances no reasons in support.[9]

Sufficient has, I think, been said to make it appear highly probable that 'Hebrews'—whatever its origin—did contain reliable early material. To maintain the contrary has rather a forced tone about it. Further than that we cannot go—till we find the book itself. Rendel Harris says he is surprised 'it has eluded us so long.'[10]

[1] *Expositor*, October 1895; he quotes Zahn to the same effect.
[2] *Op. cit.* p. 49.
[3] *On a Fresh Revision of the New Testament*, Appendix.
[4] Jerome, *Comm. on Matt.*, at xii. 13.
[5] *Op. cit.* p. 256.
[6] *Comm. on Matt.* at xxvii. 51; for the other reference, see Resch, p. 246.
[7] In his first edition, p. 341.
[8] *Expositor*, October 1895. [9] *Op. cit.* p. 75.
[10] *Sidelights on N.T. Research*, p. 100.

Literature.

THE HOLY SPIRIT.

In his new work, *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit* (Nisbet; 10s. 6d. net), Principal H. Wheeler Robinson of Regent's Park College enhances his already considerable reputation as a theologian. The volume is the third to be published in 'The Library of Constructive Theology,' a series which appears to be winning attention. The nature of the series precludes Dr. Robinson from an historical exposition of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Bible and in the dogmatic development of the Church, but a good deal of the material that would be handled in such an exposition enters into the systematic discussions of his book.

The plan of the book is broadly conceived, and is worked out in detail with reference to modern theological literature. Especially useful are some of the citations of recent German dogmaticians. The whole book shows wide culture and careful scholarship, and displays a reflective quality at once discriminating and cautious. The subject is one which is susceptible, on the positive or systematic side, of varied treatment, and Dr. Robinson came

to a happy decision, we think, as to what should be the scope and the limits of his book. It falls into three parts. In Part I., 'The Approach through Experience,' the term 'Spirit' is used in its wider and more philosophical sense, as 'the highest reality which thought can discover within or behind or above our whole experience of Nature, history and religion, and our own consciousness of personality.' The discussion is maintained accordingly, and the endeavour made to vindicate the reality of spirit. Unfortunately the discussion does not enter into the larger confirmation in philosophy of religion of the reference in religious experience to superhuman reality.

In Part II., 'The Work of the Holy Spirit,' the term 'Spirit' is used in its specifically Christian sense, and the Spirit in relation to the life of Jesus is the subject of investigation along with the 're-presentation' of Christ by the Holy Spirit. Thereafter the Church, the Scriptures, the Sacraments, and the individual life are discussed in relation to the Holy Spirit.

In Part III., 'The Holy Spirit and the Godhead,' the uses of the term 'Spirit' are correlated and extended in their theological and philosophical applications, and the problem is faced as to whether we can venture to speak of the Eternal Spirit as He is in Himself. There is much force in Dr. Robinson's contention that the failure of the classical doctrine of the Trinity to satisfy us is due not merely to the fact that it is associated with an older philosophy, but that the doctrine of the Third Person was not properly worked out from its basis in Christian experience: 'The results reached so slowly and painfully in the doctrine of the Son were virtually transferred to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit without independent discussion. The consequence was that the term was divorced from its proper content. The whole development of religious thought in recent centuries has been forcing us back on that content by compelling the modern appeal to the ultimate authority of experience.'

Dr. Robinson's comments on the tendencies of recent philosophical and theological thought are well worth considering. For instance, the conception of a 'social Trinity' is at once in line with the social emphasis of our time and consistent with the pluralistic strain in metaphysics. But when we ask in what under a Divine pluralism the unity of God subsists, we do not seem to get anything more than the 'group mind' of a community, and the existence of the 'group mind' is, after all, in the minds of the individuals composing the group. Our experience of Spirit does indeed suggest a unity, but a unity differentiated rather than individualized; and it is creational, redemptive, and sanctifying purpose rather than simultaneity that best displays the unity of the Godhead.

REALISM.

Realism, by Professor Syed Zafarul Hasan, D.Phil., M.A., LL.B. (Cambridge University Press; 16s. net), is not an easy book to read, but he who reads it with care subjects himself to a valuable discipline in patient thinking and to an education in modern philosophy. We welcome its appearance and congratulate the author on a remarkable achievement; for now that Idealism is exposed to criticism on so many sides, what can we put in its place? The most clamant claimant is Realism in one or other of its varied forms, and here is a competent critical history of the realistic movement in philosophy presented with fulness and fairness. We know of no other book that covers this ground, and students of philosophy can turn to this volume for reliable information concerning the views of modern realistic philosophers—from Reid and Hamilton down to Stout, Cook-Wilson, Alexander, Bertrand Russell and Moore, and many more, and they will be saved much time and labour by the exact patient scholarship that enabled this Indian philosopher to collect and expound their views. Nor is this merely a history—it is a critical estimate of the worth of their views by one whose judgment is at once fair and penetrating.

He confines himself largely to one topic, namely, that the external world is real and existent for us and that it is directly, not inferentially, perceived, and he points out the danger and confusion brought into philosophy by the idea that what we perceive is an idea which somehow represents reality. The vice of representationism is that you can from it never get to reality at all, never get outside the circle of your own ideas or sensations. This is the clue that guides him in his critical exposition of modern thinkers. There are no excursions into metaphysics or theology even when the temptation to launch into these realms offers itself, as in the discussion of Alexander's view of God as a kind of hypothetical Time-Space Deity about which we can know nothing, according to its author, and which, if he exists, is still growing. While the writer's self-limitation may disappoint us, yet it intensifies the value of his critical handling of his topic and gives us an additional trust in his competence. There is no endeavour to score a verbal

victory, but a patient effort to arrive at truth, and the author's own view is given in the Introduction, particularly on pp. 18 and 19, which we specially recommend the reader to ponder for its novel view on the relation between mind and matter.

We highly value this book because of the closeness of its reasoning, the sustained level of its argument, the historical wealth of knowledge displayed, and for the interest of its conclusions. By it this Indian scholar has gained a high place among the list of real thinkers.

THE HUMANITY OF GOD.

The Rev. Leonard Hodgson, M.A., Professor of Christian Apologetics in the General Theological Seminary, New York, has written what he calls an introduction to the study of the Gospels under the title *And Was Made Man* (Longmans; 9s. net). It is not an Introduction in the now technical sense of the term; it is described as an aid to the intelligent study of the Gospels which may enable readers of them to discriminate between what is, and what is not, legitimate interpretation. It is the fundamental affirmation of the book that the Gospels are best explained on the Catholic doctrine of Christ as God made Man. The endeavour is to find a picture of Christ which is not only in this sense Christian but also historically probable. In the pursuit of this endeavour the aid is invoked of the Eschatological School of Gospel interpretation, and to their contention that Jesus was a human individual whose thought was conditioned by His environment full weight is given. 'In the perfection of His humanity He was human in mind as well as in body.' And it was 'through the channels of His experience on earth' that the knowledge of His unique Divine sonship reached His mind. It is suggested that the same principle of interpretation applies to the Fourth Gospel as to the Synoptic Gospels. There also we are dealing with One who possessed a true human individuality in mind as in body, and what the Fourth Gospel gives us is, as it were, 'the inside of the synoptic portrait,' 'the facts of our Lord's life as they appeared to His own mind.'

While many would find this an interesting and helpful book, we must say that it does not satisfy us in respect either of form or substance. On the one hand, the author has an irritating way of breaking off a discussion, to be continued at some future page or even 'in our next'; and one desiderates, too, a more pointed and less abstract style and greater logical flow in the presentation. On the other hand, one desiderates also greater depth of treatment; and this is said in full view of the author's endeavour to give a philosophical setting to his work. It is not likely that the reader's mind will find satisfaction in so vague a conclusion as this: 'The Virgin Birth, then, and the Empty Tomb are necessary to Christian doctrine if they were true. I do not see that we can at present say more than this, or claim to assert either their truth or their necessity as a matter of knowledge.' Obviously Professor Hodgson (like many another teacher of theology) is sore put to it not to be positively disloyal to certain elements of traditional orthodoxy in face of the trend of modern thought.

THE SACRAMENTS.

The Rev. H. J. Wotherspoon, D.D., a well-known minister of the Church of Scotland, was chosen to deliver the Croall Lectures in 1926–27, and took as his subject *Religious Values in the Sacraments* (T. & T. Clark; 7s. net). No conjunction of lecturer and subject could be happier. Dr. Wotherspoon belongs to the 'High Church' party in Scottish Presbyterianism, and he is not only in it but of it. He is not only a partisan of seemliness and order in Divine service, but something much more. He is deeply and doctrinally 'high.' And in this book he has had the opportunity to express himself, an opportunity which he has used to our great benefit. He has tried to limit the range of his thinking by concentrating on the religious values of the Sacraments. But happily he has been unsuccessful in thus hedging himself in. He has been compelled to examine the nature and objective value of the Sacraments; and we are glad of that, for it is really what he says of the truth expressed in sacrament and of the way in which that truth is expressed that is most interesting in his book. It ought to be said at once that the tone of the book is very attractive because of its spirituality, its humility, and its obvious sincerity.

The plan of the book is to discuss, first, Sacrament generally, and this includes a chapter on grace and personality as well as one on sacrament and magic. The author shows that the Sacraments are our Lord's witnesses to an everlasting gospel. And he then proceeds to deal with Baptism and the Lord's Supper. The book is too full to be summarized, but something may be said of the chapters on the Supper. He distinguishes two aspects or 'stages' of the rite, that in which we witness to

something (the Consecration), and that in which we receive something (the Communion). All the questions that are being discussed at present come up for treatment. One, for example, is that of sacrifice. The Supper is a real sacrifice, not a repetition or prolongation of Calvary, but a witness to it. Calvary has its eternal and therefore ever-active side, and we symbolically represent this eternal act. Another point dealt with is reservation for the purpose of adoration. This is rejected because the Real Presence is there *within the rite*, and not true outside the rite.

There is a curious passage dealing with the question, 'Can a layman celebrate?' The author distinguishes between 'can' and 'may,' *i.e.* between validity and lawfulness. The former belongs to Christ, the latter to us, and as Christ has given a ministry, it is clear that the celebration is to be done by it. No one can read these glowing pages without being deeply impressed and edified, though questions do occasionally intrude themselves.

THE EVANGELICAL PARTY.

Dr. L. P. Jacks is editing a very interesting series of books on different aspects of Christian belief, or systems of belief. It is called 'The Faiths: Varieties of Christian Expression' (a title which Dr. Jacks successfully vindicates in his general preface), and we have already received, and noticed, the first two volumes, Canon Lacey's 'Anglo-Catholic Faith,' and Professor Gardner's 'Modernism in the English Church.' The third volume has now arrived, *The Evangelical Movement in the English Church*, by the Rev. Leonard E. Binns, D.D., Vicar of West Ham (Methuen; 5s. net). It is a far more difficult subject than either of the others. Our main difficulty is that there is really no evangelical party to-day. Many Anglo-Catholics are more evangelical in regard to faith than members of any other school. And there are a great many people who are called Modernists who claim to be thoroughly evangelical. Professor Robertson Smith and Principal Denney were both 'broad' about criticism but were intensely orthodox and evangelical in doctrine. If we take the words in the old sense, the 'evangelical party' was composed of men all of one type, which is represented to-day by the Keswick School, orthodox all round, and not 'liberal' in any sense. The defect of this book is that Dr. Binns is not evangelical in this older sense. He claims to be 'eclectic,' and his book shows that he is what is called a 'liberal evangelical.' It would in a way have been far more useful, from the point of view of the series and its aims, to have got a thoroughgoing man of the type of the late Bishop Moule to write this book.

However, Dr. Binns understands the evangelical standpoint, and shares it in essentials. And he has given us a most satisfactory account of it, both historically and doctrinally. He is by no means a blind partisan. He sees as clearly as any one the defects of the traditional evangelical outlook. It has been too individualistic, too suspicious, too narrow in its attitude to the 'world,' too lacking in a corporate sense. He sees also its strength, its concern for souls, and its insistence on the free access of the soul to God without any priestly mediator. Conversion, sanctification, consecration are the three words that sum up what the older evangelical thought of as the gospel and its fruits. But he held this on the basis of an infallible Bible, and that was the source of his power.

All this Dr. Binns discourses upon with unfailing interest. His book is full of light, and if the 'evangelical party' were represented by him and his standpoint it might face the future with confidence. But how many of the 'evangelicals' (in the older sense) would speak of the story of the Fall as a legend?

THE HEBREW BOOK OF ENOCH.

A very learned work entitled *3 Enoch; or, The Hebrew Book of Enoch*, by Mr. Hugo Odeberg, Ph.D., has just been published at 42s. net by the Cambridge University Press. The complete Hebrew Book of Enoch, which is based on a Bodleian MS., has never been printed before, and fortunately the text is accompanied by a complete translation and an elaborate commentary.

The book carries its readers into a field with which few can pretend to be familiar. It is largely occupied with accounts of the angelic world which involve very elaborate angelological systems. Dr. Odeberg, who carefully traces its literary antecedents, comes to the conclusion that its redaction may be assigned to some date in the third century A.D. The book purports to be a revelation of secrets by Metatron, who is described as having many titles and offices. He is 'the Prince of the Presence,' *i.e.* the angel who has access to the Divine Presence; he is the attendant of the Throne of Glory, the angelic ruler over and judge of all the hosts of angels and angel-princes; he is even described as the 'Little Yahwe.' The interest of this figure is that he is the translated

Enoch, the tiny hint in Gn 5^{24} being expanded in unbelievably fantastic ways until Enoch is transformed into an angel and then promoted into a superior angel-prince, the intermediary through whom the secret doctrine was brought down to men. The book, however, is not all of a piece; in parts of it certain functions of Metatron are divided among different angelic beings, and in places there is even an attack on Metatron, at any rate an attempt to degrade him from his high estate.

The origin of the word Metatron, which is obscure, is learnedly discussed by Dr. Odeberg. It has been derived from the Latin *metator*, connected with *Mithra*, and so on. The derivation which seems to Dr. Odeberg most plausible is *μετά* + *θρόνον*, 'the Throne next to the (Divine) Throne,' *i.e.* the second Throne. The conception of Metatron in 3 Enoch is compared with that in the earlier and later mystical literature. The whole discussion is the work of a patient and admirable scholar who has minutely explored a region of speculation in which the later Jewish spirit loved to dwell, but which has little enough to do with the terra firma of the Old Testament. The book is appropriately dedicated to Canon Box, who has done so much to promote the study of Jewish literature.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION.

The number of books coming from America dealing with religious education shows how acute are the problems facing the people there, and perhaps also the interest being taken in the subject. The favourite point of view at present is the 'project,' an attempt to educate from a concrete situation as starting-point. But some leading minds are taking a wider and more inclusive point of view. Among these is Professor T. G. Soares. His book, *Religious Education* (Cambridge University Press; 12s. 6d. net), is one of the very best we have come across. It seems to contain the final (or at least provisionally final) conclusions of this educator on the nature, methods, and aims of religious education. He discusses, first, the nature of the human material, then the kind of religion with which education is concerned, then the characteristics of the educational process, and finally the experiences of the religious unit in fellowship.

Professor Soares shares the American emphasis on the practical. Education is directed experience, and the methods he suggests are mainly on the lines of the 'Project.' But he is not a slave to this idea, and recognizes the claim of, for example, purely intellectual interests. His book is not entirely theoretical. He has worked out a kind of curriculum for himself in all its details, showing how a child's time should be spent over a week, including Sunday.

There is a gulf between the Professor and his American sympathizers on the one hand, and our educators on the other. He does not want the Bible in the school, or hymns, or prayers, or worship. We do. We do not believe that education is possible except on a religious basis. And if the basis of education is religious we do not see how it can with any reason at all be kept out of school. Moreover, Professor Soares gives the Bible an entirely different place from that which we give it. He says that a systematic study of the Bible ought to wait 'for the high-school age.' Is this our Secondary School age? If so, we over here totally disagree on purely educational grounds. Earlier than high-school age he would not have the Bible at all, apparently, except that we might use its stories as we do those in other literature. We need not argue this out. As a matter of fact our teachers here are entirely, even fiercely, opposed to such an idea.

It will be seen that there is provocative matter in this book. But it is suggestive and in many ways enlightening. It ought to be studied and tested by our educators here. If we do not entirely agree with American methods, or even with their principles, we have something to learn from them. And Professor Soares has put us all in his debt by his able book.

THE SON OF MAN.

The Son of Man, by Emil Ludwig, the well-known biographer of Bismarck, Napoleon, and the Kaiser (Benn; 15s. net), is a disappointment. In the preface we are told 'one who would venture to ascribe to Jesus imaginary sayings and doings should be a person at least equal to Jesus in intuitive power. Chapter and verse in one or more of the Gospels can be given for everything that Jesus is here portrayed as having said or done.' Presumably the author imagines he has been loyal to this canon. But no reader can agree with him. He interprets scenes in the most arbitrary fashion; he reads into Christ's mind, as boy and man and teacher, moods and feelings for which there is no tittle of evidence, often quite fancifully and sometimes unpleasantly enough. We hear now and then of His 'cold pride,' of panic flight, of a temper frayed and broken by the stress of life, and so on.

And the end comes in sheer despair and the sense of utter failure.

Herr Ludwig tells us that he does not understand theology and leaves it untouched, dealing, not with Christ, but simply with Jesus. But whatever you call Him, this is a Figure who, as He said Himself, is a test and touchstone, terribly final, for every one that comes in contact with Him. Frankly, one has to say that He reveals our author as a rather dull soul.

THE SUFFERING OF THE IMPASSIBLE GOD.

The very title of this book—*The Suffering of the Impassible God*, by the Rev. Bertrand R. Brasnett, M.A., B.D. (S.P.C.K.; 7s. 6d.)—is a contradiction in terms. For suffering is just the opposite of impassibility, and yet the title adequately describes the method of the author. He works out his thesis in seven chapters and six appendices, and his thesis is that it is only by combining the truth of both extremes in a higher synthesis that the full truth of this abstruse subject can be fully explicated. Even when we cannot get an intellectual synthesis he would maintain the truth of both views. Somewhat after the Aristotelian manner of arriving at truth, he works out on the one hand the value for religious experience of the idea that God can somehow suffer, and on the other hand the truth in the view that it is impossible that the blessed God can suffer in our sense of the term, and after purging both of their dross he seeks to effect a lusis or solution in a resultant combination. This is the well-known Aristotelian and Hegelian method, although on this particular topic it may be argued that the motive that urged the Church to condemn the Patripassian heresy was furnished by Aristotle's view of God as Thought meditating on its own beatific illumination, rather than from the Scriptures, where God is spoken of in the most frank, anthropomorphic fashion.

The book is purely dogmatic in method—dogmatic in the best sense of the term; but it leaves out history and Scripture. This is surely a loss, however inevitable it may be, and it is particularly felt in the discussion on the Incarnation. The writer says more on Christ's Divine consciousness as an infant than on His sufferings on the Cross. We regret the almost total neglect of the Atonement, surely the crux of this question, for, if God suffers eternally in the sense that Christ suffered once on Calvary, it is difficult to see the purpose of the Incarnation or to answer Anselm's question—*Cur Deus homo?* There is a very fine chapter on the Holy Spirit, and the appendices, where the views of von Hügel, Randles, Hughes, Relton, M'Connell, Hinton, and Mozley are discussed, are on a high level of critical power and spiritual insight. The book is a welcome addition to the literature of one of the most difficult topics in theology and is worthy of great praise for its sustained thinking and reverent spirit.

EUSTATHIUS.

The mind is threatened with bewilderment among the many cross-currents of honest thought, crooked policy, and personal animosities which marked the age of the early Councils. 'Nicæa in reality meant the victory of a mere handful of Bishops who, with the support of the Emperor, had defeated all opposition, had swayed the majority, and had given Christendom a creed after their own liking. The majority of the Bishops of the East, if they were interested in doctrinal questions, came to see that they had signed something which, when they went to Nicæa, they had no intention of signing.' Thus correctly does the Rev. R. V. Sellers, B.D., Vicar of Mytholmroyd, Yorkshire, gauge the situation. He is concerned with revealing *Eustathius of Antioch and his Place in the Early History of Doctrine* (Cambridge University Press; 8s. 6d. net). He is well aware of the faults of his hero whose violence of language against the Eusebians is sometimes extreme, but he shows that the theology of Eustathius is startlingly modern and is well worth study. We receive this excellent monograph with great gratitude.

CHRYSOSTOM.

The life of Chrysostom is one of the obscurest in the annals of the ancient Church. It is difficult to separate fact from mere legend and pious fiction. The main source of reliable information is the Dialogue of Palladius, written about A.D. 408. Mr. P. R. Coleman-Norton, A.M., D.Phil., chose this ancient work as the subject of his thesis for the Doctorate in Philosophy, and now after five years' extra study he has published it—*Palladii Dialogus de Vita S. Joannis Chrysostomi* (Cambridge University Press; 15s. net).

The volume consists of Introduction, a Revised Text with Critical Apparatus, Notes, Appendices, and Indices. We find throughout evidence of real scholarship and mature judgment. We wish that a translation had been included, in order that so

fine a monument of patient and arduous study might have appealed to a far wider circle.

A new book on Darwin needs a good deal to justify it; there are already so many, both biographical and scientific. The main features of *The Evolution of Charles Darwin*, by Professor G. A. Dorsey (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net), are its unconventionality and its whole-hearted hero-worship. As to the latter the writer says: 'Conceivably no one more benefited mankind and revolutionised human thought.' As to the former feature, we have the titles of the chapters, such as 'He married his cousin, and lived happily ever after,' and 'What he saw astounded the world,' not to speak of the conversational style of the writing.

Those who know little or nothing about Darwin, however, will find in Professor Dorsey's book a good picture of the man and the scientist. The author knows and loves his subject, and he selects and arranges in a very interesting fashion much of what has been revealed to us of Darwin by himself and others. We are brought into contact with a character rare in its beautiful simplicity and purity. We see his intense and persistent curiosity leading from one field to another. We rejoice with him in his happy home-life, and follow eagerly his progress from stage to stage of discovery and speculation. It is a fine story, and it is told well here by a writer who has a distinct gift of vision. It is a pity that he is subject to such marked prejudices. These, however, will not do a reader any harm, and may even amuse him.

We have no hesitation in recommending a volume of Sermons edited by Sir James Marchant. The names of the contributors are a sufficient guarantee. They are The Archbishop of Armagh, Very Rev. Geo. H. Morrison, Rev. A. E. Garvie, The Bishop of Winchester, Rev. R. J. Campbell, Miss A. Maude Royden, Rev. W. E. Orchard, Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, The Bishop of London, Rev. F. B. Meyer, Very Rev. W. R. Inge, Rev. H. Wheeler Robinson, The Bishop of Gloucester, Rev. P. N. Waggett, Rev. John A. Hutton, Rev. H. R. L. Sheppard, Rev. Studdert Kennedy, Rev. L. P. Jacks, Rev. F. W. Norwood, and the Rev. James Moffatt. But there is a second source of attraction in this volume. The title gives it—*If I had only One Sermon to preach* (Cassell; 7s. 6d. net). These twenty ministers are here preaching their *one* sermon. We have here, as we would expect, the central verities of the Faith—love and the Cross of Christ, God's purpose for man, the eternal values and the hope of immortality.

A revised and enlarged edition of the Rev. T. H. Walker's *Echoes and Memories* (David J. Clark, Cadogan Street, Glasgow; 5s. net) will be welcomed by all who are familiar with Mr. Walker's racy and impressionistic style. In the course of his long ministry and extensive travels he has come into more or less intimate contact with many men and women who have affected the religious thought of our time; and in this semi-autobiographical sketch there are interesting reminiscences of James Morison, John and Edward Caird, Parker, Spurgeon, Jowett, J. P. Struthers, Lord Blythswood, and many others. The sketches are enlivened by anecdotes, and these lively pages reflect many aspects of the religious and social life of the last half-century.

A volume of sermons for the Sacraments of the Eucharist and of Baptism has been published by the Rev. William Ross, B.D. The title is *Till He Come* (T. & T. Clark). The price is the low one of 5s. Mr. Ross is a minister of the United Free Church of Scotland, and the Sermons are arranged to suit the custom of Presbyterian churches at Communion seasons—before the Table, at the Table, and after the Table. They will be found most helpful in those churches where Communion seasons are rare, and where the strain of preparing for great occasions is severe. But there is something suggestive in them for all denominations. And that the thought is uncommon, may be seen by looking at the Christian Year, the Eleventh Sunday after Trinity, where we give a sermon of Mr. Ross's, in shortened form, taken from the Epistle for that day.

Those who have read that fascinating book, 'The Moslem World in Revolution,' will welcome another from the same pen. The Rev. W. Wilson Cash, D.S.O., has made a profound study of the religious situation in the Near East, and is qualified by personal experience to speak with authority on everything Muhammadan. He has now published *The Expansion of Islam* (Edinburgh House Press; 3s. 6d. net), in which he surveys the history of the faith, the character of its founder, its institutions, and inner genius. All this forms the basis of a penetrating discussion of the present position and prospects of Islam. Mr. Cash is far from thinking

that the present upheaval presages the final overthrow of Islam. 'The Christian Church, however, is challenged to show what Christianity has to offer that a Moslem cannot find in Islam. . . . History shows that the two bodies have understood one another best when they have frankly confessed that each has something to contribute to the other. . . . The Christian line of approach to Islam must be one of respect, not of superiority. . . . Yet the fact remains that Christ has been the inspiration of all that is best and noblest in life. When, therefore, the Moslem world challenges us to show what Christianity has to offer we point with all confidence to Christ, the Hope of the world—to Him who said, with a wealth of sympathetic understanding hitherto unknown, "Come unto ME all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest."'

Sir Arthur Keith recently caused a flutter in certain circles by his pronouncements on evolution. It was not so much his declaration that it was scientifically provable that man was a product of evolution as the moral and spiritual consequences he seemed to regard as necessarily flowing from that position that gave prominence to his utterance. These conclusions were so negative that it is difficult to see how, holding them, the eternal values of life can be conserved—save as a nebulous fancy without real basis. Mr. J. Parton Milum, B.Sc., Ph.D., in *Evolution and the Spirit of Man* (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), deals with this whole subject in all its aspects. The scientific data are gathered from every relevant field—embryology, anthropology, archæology, and biology are all made to yield their contribution—and this is done with up-to-date knowledge. In the light of these facts the author endeavours to show that man is unique though related to all life, that his evolution has been along a line peculiar to man himself, and that the resultant is a being who, on mental, moral, and spiritual grounds, stands in a category alone.

The book is timely. The author has done his work well, and many will read him with interest and profit. There is a liveliness about his style which will make it easier for the reader to pursue his argument, although now and then this liveliness, as it appears to us, is in danger of becoming somewhat rollicking. We do not feel happy reading a sentence like the following about the birth in Bethlehem: 'It is not overdrawing the narrative to say that the very stars twinkled with the humour of God when He got Himself born in a stable at Bethlehem.' This may rouse a kind of interest, but we feel the author would improve if he resisted the temptation to put the matter as he does. But in spite of numerous instances of this kind we have here a deeply interesting book on a serious topic, handled with knowledge, vision, and enthusiasm; and it will banish from shaken minds any fears that evolution destroys man's unique position, and convince them that it is possible to be an evolutionist and be yet a moralist and a Christian.

A republication of *The Spiritual Guide of de Molinos* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s. net) will be welcome to many. It is introduced by a pleasant essay from the hands of Mr. Dugald Macfadyen in which the nature and method of mysticism are briefly outlined and the place of de Molinos indicated. The 'Spiritual Guide' itself is so well known that nothing need be said except to note its appearance in a delightful form both as to print and binding. If in this form it attracts many readers, so much the better for the life of the Church and of religion.

Of the importance of Tertullian for the theology of the West most of our readers, we presume, have some idea. To many, however, it will be a revelation to have set before them so cogently as the Rev. James Morgan, M.A., B.D., has done just how many of the prevailing ideas and emphases of Western theology are traceable to the great African Bishop. *The Importance of Tertullian in the Development of Christian Dogma* (Kegan Paul; 7s. 6d. net) is an ably done piece of work which we warmly commend.

The Ingersoll Lectures at Harvard University have produced several valuable little books. The subject is Immortality, and writers of very varied schools, from Kirsopp Lake to H. E. Fosdick, have made their contributions. The latest volume is by Herr Gustav Krüger, Professor of Church History in the University of Giessen, and the title is *The Immortality of Man*, according to the views of the men of the Enlightenment (Milford; 4s. 6d. net). The lecture is a fascinating historical account of the development of opinion on this great subject. Hume, Kant, Spinoza, Schleiermacher, all appear in this mood, and the style is so easy and the thought so simple and direct that it is an unalloyed pleasure to read.

While Mary Slessor was doing her rough, pioneering work in Calabar, another saintly woman, of very different constitution and character, was

labouring in the Ibo country, a hundred and fifty miles to the west. Gentle, refined, and methodical in her ways, she did a great work among the women and girls of West Africa during a period of thirty-three years. Her life-story has been briefly written by the Rev. G. T. Basen, M.A., Litt.D., under the title *Edith Warner of the Niger* (Seeley, Service ; 3s. 6d. net). It is the simple, yet inspiring record of a fragrant Christian life.

We cannot praise too highly the admirable enterprise of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge in their series of 'Texts for Students.' No. 43 is Cyprian's *De Unitate Ecclesiæ*—Introduction, Text, Translation, and Notes. It was entrusted to Mr. E. H. Blakeney, M.A., and has been adequately edited. The price is only 2s. 6d.

There is a peculiar fascination in books that are first-hand, and especially in the realm of history. And here is one : *English Preachers and Preaching, 1640–1670 : A Secular Study,* by Caroline Francis Richardson (S.P.C.K. ; 10s. 6d.). The book comes from New Orleans, and is printed in the United States. It is a study of the preachers and of preaching in the seventeenth century, made from original documents, which are quoted frequently. The bibliography occupies twenty-five pages and the index twenty-eight. We have all sorts of quaint facts about preaching, sermons, sermon preparation, church-going habits, hobbies, and activities of preachers outside their pulpit, the payment of ministers, sermon helps, and hosts of other interesting matters. Preachers (at least some) needed pabulum, as they do now. Some even 'borrowed' their sermons. The popular style was memorized discourse. The pay was small, £40 a year on an average. Many clergymen were human enough to have secular interests, like music, poetry, astrology, and antiquities. But the most striking thing about that sermon-ridden age was the thirst for preaching. Lawrence Chadderton once concluded a sermon that had lasted two hours with the assurance that he did not wish to trespass on the patience of his audience. 'Whereupon all the auditory cried out, "For God's sake, sir, go on, go on." '

S. François De Sales, by Mr. E. K. Sanders (S.P.C.K. ; 12s.), is an entirely competent bit of work. The subject is a rich and many-sided one —the deeply religious nature of the man, the strength of will, always courageous if sometimes calmly blind to others' point of view, the uncanny knowledge of those queer hearts of ours even in their more shadowy places, the success as a missioner among the Calvinists, the intrepid bishop, the popular preacher, the writer of the letters and the famous spiritual books, the saintly soul—there surely is enough to fire a biographer and to set readers' hearts ablaze. And yet, somehow one is never thrilled, lays down the book with an unhappy feeling that St. François was a smaller man than one had thought. Why that should be it is not easy to make clear, for the writer is whole-hearted in admiration, even a little indiscriminating in praise. Yet the book does not storm the heart, nor grip the interest closely, is perhaps just a little ordinary, but quite competent.

Mr. Bertrand Russell is a brilliant and provocative writer, whose eminence as a mathematical physicist has given undue influence to his views on ethics and religion. In publishing 'Why I am not a Christian' he has definitely challenged criticism, and now a powerful and, as many will feel, an adequate answer has been issued by Mr. H. G. Wood, M.A., under the title *Why Mr. Bertrand Russell is not a Christian* (S.C.M. ; 4s. net). Mr. Wood writes with great force and vigour. He has a competent knowledge of Bertrand Russell's philosophy, and among the weapons of his armoury not the least effective are his flashes of wit. The general line of his argument is that Mr. Russell 'rejects Christianity without understanding either the real strength or the more serious difficulties of the Christian position,' that 'he has a very imperfect acquaintance with the history either of the Christian Church or of European morals,' and that 'he is satisfied with a trivial estimate of Jesus based on conventional and superficial judgments.'

Of all matters that are before the Church at present perhaps the most important in one aspect is the training of its ministers. There is general agreement that in certain respects that training is defective. It has been in the past too intellectual and not sufficiently directed to practical usefulness. This applies to all the churches. But in one way the Church of England feels the defect most because its ministers are charged with pastoral duties that do not fall to the lot of other churches. And the well-known author of 'Psychology and the Christian Life,' Canon T. W. Pym, has set himself to remedy this defect so far as mere book help can go. His lectures are called *Spiritual Direction,* and he describes them as 'An Essay in Pastoral Theology in the Light of Present Needs' (S.C.M. ; 5s. net).

The main object of the book is to help ministers to deal with individual souls, and particularly in the matter of confession. There is a great deal of wisdom in these pages, and it is happily wisdom that can be absorbed and put in practice. We might summarize the contents somewhat as follows. Remember the differences in people's religious nature, confession is not for everybody. But if you are to be a father in God, be accessible, be thorough, be open-eyed. Don't seek dominance. Get your remedy for an evil by suggestion, not dictation. These are some of the maxims that are developed in a book specially suitable for priests but not without its value for others, including laymen.

The Resurrection Appearances of Jesus.

By the Reverend A. T. Cadoux, B.A., D.D., Glasgow.

One of the most indubitable and extraordinary facts of ancient history is that certain Jews of the first century accepted a crucified Man as the Messiah of God. This fact witnesses the unique impressiveness of the Man in a way that concurs with what has been transmitted to us of His words and acts. But if we listen to the witnesses themselves, we have to acknowledge that the supreme wisdom and goodness of Jesus were not the only factors in their belief that He was the Christ. They grounded their faith not only on what they had experienced of His life and death, but on certain experiences after His death in which they were sure that they saw Him again and heard Him speak to them.

These things are indubitable, but when we ask what was the precise nature of the Resurrection experiences, it is not easy to be agreed upon a reply. The difficulties attending the attempt to harmonize the various gospel accounts of the Resurrection and the equally great difficulties intrinsic in each of them are too obvious to need emphasis. It evidently involves something supernormal, but it concerns a realm whose norms are unknown to us. Nor does it help to say that what is to us supernormal must be expected from a unique personality; because the Resurrection appearances are not repeated, so that we have no right to say that they are normal to the risen Christ. If, on the other hand, we say, as apparently we should, that these appearances were supernormal as necessary to meet the unique need of His followers immediately after His death, then their exact nature does not greatly concern us. What is important is that these experiences broke through the Jewish prejudice that would otherwise have left Jesus' truth of God in the grave.

Many modern Christians find that they can no longer hold the belief that Jesus rose bodily from the grave, and took to heaven the very body that hung upon the Cross. That which can pass through closed doors cannot be said to be a human body in any sense intelligible to us. The difficulty is enhanced by the Ascension. What was not an impossible idea to the Jew, with his notion of a flat earth and overlying heaven, becomes grotesque to us. And another objection to this conception is that it makes the Resurrection precisely the sort of sign that Jesus condemned: it is taken as an act of God's power accrediting spiritual truth. But we have to acknowledge that it is precisely so that the first disciples, according to the early chapters of Acts, seem to have taken it. It was to them a miracle by which God proved that Jesus, though crucified, was Messiah. And all the gospel accounts emphasize the empty grave, which has no significance except for corporal resurrection, though, of course, this may reflect the mind of the generation that wrote the Gospels rather than that of the Apostles themselves. But if the Apostles looked on the Resurrection as a sign, it does not follow that they were right in doing so; for they frequently misunderstood Jesus. Nor may we argue that the results prove the correctness of their understanding on this point; for one of the most significant things in Christianity is Jesus' power to work through men who only partially understand Him.

Many therefore to-day believe that Jesus appeared after death not in 'the flesh' but in a glorified or heavenly body. And their claim is supported in part, at least, by our earliest and best witness, Paul, who in detailing the evidence (1 Co 15^{3-8}) does not mention the empty tomb. It is perhaps beside the point to ask whether the body in which Jesus died was transformed, or whether the body in which He appeared was normal to His

risen spirit or was specially assumed, or of what it was composed; for whatever happened in this way would be so far from our mortal experience as to disqualify speculation on its exact nature. There are some to whom the results claimed by spiritualism are helpful in this respect: to others the mediumistic trance and other characteristics of spiritualism make the suggestion of this analogy distasteful. It is in any case probable that all that most Christians feel necessary to believe here is that what the disciples saw and heard was related to the living Jesus in such a way as to give means of identification and expression to His spirit, analogous to the way in which our features and voices express and identify us.

If we want to pursue the matter further, we are left with the alternative that what the disciples saw was either a 'spiritual body' normal to the risen spirit of Jesus, and made for their sakes abnormally visible and audible, or that the spirit of Jesus used whatever means might be available to express itself in that particular time and place.

The former is more commonly held and probably approximates to the thought of Paul. But it has its difficulties. For we have to ask, What is the relation of this spiritual body to the constant spiritual presence of Jesus with His followers? Is He more personally present, more indubitable, in the former than in the latter? Paul seems to have thought of a spiritual body of Jesus that arose from the grave and ascended into heaven, where it would abide until the last day, and whence it spoke to him on the road to Damascus. At the same time he had the experience of Christ with and in him, as an abiding personal presence, in the way contemplated also in Mt 28^{20} and in Jn $14^{18.\ 19}$, $16^{16.\ 22}$. It is difficult to relate these two ideas. We seem compelled to regard one as more exact than the other. And if it were not for the apostolic insistence upon the actuality of the Resurrection appearances, we should probably take it that we were intended to understand the ascension of Jesus and His session at the right hand of God as figurative of His full triumph, and that His presence with His Church was that which must be more literally understood. In any case we seem compelled to understand that the visible heavenly body of Jesus is not necessary to His most real and valuable personal presence.

These considerations make us see that there is not very much difference between those who think of Jesus as appearing to His disciples in a glorified body, and those who believe that the personality of Jesus found, for the occasion, the means of its expression in the physical or psychical conditions of the universe. And when we have got so far, it becomes worth while considering what assistance psychology affords. For it is to be noted that Paul, our earliest and best witness, besides ignoring the story of the empty tomb, speaks (*loc. cit.*) of all the Resurrection experiences as though they were of the same kind as his own on the road to Damascus.

Now psychology has little hesitation in recognizing this experience of Paul's as that of a vision conditioned by his struggle against convictions which facts were forcing upon him. The fact of Christ and of His followers, including Stephen, had laid hold of those regions of Paul's self which were beyond the control of his accepted Pharisaic scheme of life. The Pharisee in him refused to acknowledge the reaction of the man to Christ, and struggled to suppress it. And what we struggle to suppress in ourselves may, under certain conditions, break into our consciousness in vision. So upon the Pharisee there broke in vision the question and the command of Christ, and Paul accepted the truth whereby thenceforth he lived.

May we not think the same of the disciples' vision of their risen Lord? They had left all to follow Him: had seen in Him the patently Divine: had confessed Him the Christ. And then came teaching about suffering and shame and death, which they did not understand. They followed to Jerusalem in bewildered faithfulness. They saw the amazing popularity of the first days overshadowed by priestly menace. Then came the agony of Gethsemane, when the Master seemed so little like Himself, and, hard upon that, the arrest and the Cross. They fled and left Him. All their Jewish scheme of things, inured in their race and imbibed from babyhood, cried out that there must be some mistake—this crucified man could not be the Messiah of God. And yet all that had made them once say, 'Thou art the Christ,' pressed to be remembered. And the agony of their great Friend and Master, the heroism and self-abandoning devotion of His suffering, the wonder of so great a love, must have come as a massive reinforcement of all the unsophisticated insight and honest recognition that had moved them to their great confession. That was the conflict: on the one hand, the appeal and hold of Jesus, of Jesus in His suffering and death, upon all that is deepest and most capable of supremacy in human nature, upon all that makes us capable of worship and loyalty; and on the other hand, the limited and imperfect scheme of things accepted from their race and time, and reinforced by social pressure. Given such a

conflict in such people and in such a time, and we should expect that with them, as with Paul, a vision of Christ triumphant would be the means by which His truth would celebrate its triumph in them.

To do justice to such a view as this we must remember the important place of the seen vision and the heard voice in Hebrew religion. These experiences are characteristic of the great prophets and seem essential to their work, for they lie behind the prophetic utterance, 'Thus saith the Lord.' When Amos wrote, 'The lion hath roared, who will not fear? The Lord hath spoken, who can but prophesy?'; when Isaiah saw the vision and heard the voice, 'Whom shall I send?'; when Jeremiah argued with God,—they were surely not merely giving literary expression to what they knew to be the conscious workings of their own minds. The Hebrew prophets knew well enough that the vision and the voice *might* be deceptive, but they regarded these experiences as, in fact, the highest vehicles of Divine truth.

Psychology justifies their valuation. For, as we have noted, under certain circumstances the seeing of a vision or the hearing of a voice is the only means by which the most valuable truth can get a foothold in the world. The prophet, being a morally sensitive man, is also a humble and an ardent man. He feels a truth that condemns what is universally accepted: how dare he think that he is right and all the world wrong? His modesty compels him to suppress the growing conviction, and this suppression induces a state of inward conflict which psychology tells us is liable to visions and voices. The suppressed truth breaks upon his consciousness as a heard voice, and his conscience recognizes its Divine authority. Then, and not till then, he can stand against the world and say, Thus saith the Lord. In vision and voice there came to the prophets immovable conviction for themselves and assurance against the world. And the function of vision and voice in breaking a way for truth through convention and prejudice is not confined to them. We see, for instance, in the case of Joan of Arc that vision and voice made genius and patriotism sure enough of themselves and impressive enough to others to break through the otherwise impregnable convention that left all power in the hands of high-born incompetence.

And why may not the means that brought objective truth to the prophets have served the disciples? We can easily understand that, apart from their own difficulty in accepting a crucified Messiah, the Apostles would have found it very hard to proclaim the triumph of Jesus had they only been able to say, 'We feel,' or, 'We conclude,' for they would have been met by the unanimous voice of authority, 'We feel and conclude otherwise.' But if they could say, 'We saw,' authority had no reply.

It may be said that such an understanding of the Resurrection appearances makes them subjective only. But if suppression of truth induces a condition in which the suppressed truth breaks its way into consciousness by means of vision, the vision is rather a corrective of subjectivity, for it is the vehicle of ignored reality. It is true that certain elements of the appearance are found in the consciousness of the recipient, but that is true of ordinary perception: both are objective, though in a different way, if they are essential to the mind's awareness of reality. There is thus no reason why a vision of Jesus should not be as truly and directly expressive of His personality as the words heard by the prophets were truly and directly expressive of the will of God.

Another point may be noted here. It is the innate bent of personality towards unity which induces the reappearance in vision of any suppressed but important element of experience; and the more important the suppressed element is to the unity of personality, the stronger will be this pressure; hence it happens characteristically with moral and religious elements. And when we remember that in these cases the suppression of an element of personality means the refusal of consciousness to recognize an element of reality upon the recognition of which the wholeness of personal life depends, we see that if the Resurrection appearances were visions of this sort, they were the natural expression not simply of the surviving personality of Jesus, but of the truth that in Him human personality finds its wholeness, because in Him the universe in which man lives has the master-key to its unity.

Such a view of these visions (if they were such) and their validity implies, of course, what the visions themselves impart, *i.e.* the conviction that death did not make an end of Jesus, but that through death He is all the more God's regent, at the right hand of power, the essential agent of God's sovereignty in the soul of man. Doubt this, and the things that He makes supreme in God are not really supreme. And it would seem that we must look at it in some such way as this, if we would recognize the triumph of Jesus in His resurrection as a spiritual triumph, and not as a sort of attesting sign such as He condemned. It

must be the quality of His death that assures to us the fact of His resurrection, rather than the miracle of His resurrection that assures the god-likeness of His death. The spiritual rather validates the content of the appearances than depends on them for its validity. Indeed, it seems that the nature of the appearances can be understood only if His spirit had already triumphed in the hearts of His disciples. For He did not appear to them in the sorrow of soul in which He had left them. Whence the change? Death had released Him from bodily pain, but what had changed His sorrow to peace? If His sorrow was caused by the world's sin, the world of Israel and the Twelve and the Gentiles, had that cause been removed or diminished? If there had already been a change in the hearts of the Eleven, then there was the beginning and promise of victory, not otherwise. The appearance itself could not effect that change, for it could not have been of the sort it was until that change was effected. And any change effected by the miraculous nature of an appearance cannot be deeply spiritual: if they really needed a miracle to assure them that Jesus in His suffering was nearer to God than Caiaphas in his success, then their misunderstanding of Him would only be confirmed by such a miracle. Considered in this way, we may regard the appearance of Jesus to His disciples in vision as the result of the working of His spirit in their hearts, winning them to His truth and fashioning for Himself from the psychic elements of their inward conflict the vision that should lift His triumph into the centre of their conscious life and give them the inward wholeness that is peace and power.

In this way we may see the triumph of His death achieved in the very conditions of actual life that gave human worth to the triumph of His personality. He reigns in the inevitable and surrounding facts of life. He reigns in and by means of what is the essential and characteristic and formative urge of personality—the urge to an ordered and inclusive unity. His triumph in us comes in that which it gives—the inward unity that is peace and power—our triumph over self-division in self-devotion to One who evokes our glad loyalty and entire worship. So upon the experience of His resurrection follows Pentecost.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Why People come to Church.

By Professor A. J. Gossip, M.A., Glasgow.

'Go to the ant, consider her ways, and be wise.'—Pr 6^{6}.

Why do people come to church? I don't know, you say. I wish they didn't. The singing is all right; and the prayers are not too bad; but the sermon never ends at all! I know, poor little tousley-head, with the fidgety hands, and the legs that can't keep still, and the wee voice that keeps whispering to Mother, 'Is he nearly done now!' There was a picture about that in *Punch* the other month that showed us a fed-up little soul so very anxious to get home, asking its mother hopefully, as if one chance was still left and it might come true, 'Mother! Mother! if the church went on fire, would he stop then?'

Yet, you know, people like to come to church. Whatever for? you ask. Because they are looking for something that they want, that they must have, and they think they can find it here.

And that brings me to the ants. You know what they are, don't you? No! no! Not Aunt Jessie nor Aunt Any-body-at-all, but the creepy, crawly, little things that go running to and fro so busily upon the ground. They are a clever little folk the ants. They grow crops like the farmers! Did you know that? And they have games, just like your school, with huge crowds looking on. And they march out to battle in battalions under officers. Perhaps that isn't really clever; for war is a stupid thing. Yet it's strange, isn't it, that these tiny heads of theirs have brains wise enough to think out things like that. But the cleverest thing of all, surely, is this.

South Africa is, in places, a hot country, sometimes dreadfully hot. For months and months and months there is never a drop of rain, and the sun blazes down day after day, and the grass withers, and the trees shrivel up, and the sheep die, and all the streams are bare and dry, no longer streams at all, but just hot stones, too hot by far to touch. And yet, even there, the great heaps in which the ants live are moist and wet and full of the damp, steamy heat they love. And people couldn't understand it. Quite close the ground was hard and cracked and gaping; and clouds of

dust were blowing past, and all living things were parched and yellowed and dead. Yet here was the great ant-heap moist as ever!

And it was only a few months ago that they found out how it is done. Working very, very carefully about and around and under a huge ant-heap, they came upon a passage just like the shaft of a mine that runs down and down and down into the earth. And this shaft, too, was beautifully made, and led down and down for sixty-five feet, down and down to a stream, so far underground that the sun can't touch it and so it is not dried up in drought, but runs there full and cool and fresh as ever. And the ants kept hurrying there and hurrying back with water, in their mouths I suppose; and they watered their little fields of fungus-crops, and spilt it all about, to keep things nice and wet and steamy; and so back for more and more. It took them a long time to go and come, about half an hour, I think. How could those watching know? Oh, easily enough! They might mark them with little dots of different colours, and watch, and by and by, 'Look, there's Mr. Red-dot back again; he took half an hour. And here's the yellow fellow. He was slower, and was away thirty-five minutes!' Anyway, they keep at it, down and up, and back and fro, the whole day long.

Now, that's why people come to church. They are hot and dusty and tired. They want water to cool and to cleanse and to refresh them. And Jesus Christ can give it them. I, said He, have living water, always running, always cool, and always there for any one that wants it. And one of the shafts that leads down to it starts here. Listen! Can't you hear it running and laughing and leaping. Well, the folk round you have come for that, so that their hearts mayn't get all dry and hard and cross and selfish and grumpy, but may be green and happy and full of lovely things. That's why they are here.

But there is another thing. All the ants have to go down for the water, not just one or two, or a few of them picked for the job, but all of them. During the night those called in from other work are set to this, and the whole crowd of them keep hurrying up and hastening down, over and over and over again.

And if we are to get this water you must do your part and help to bring it. 'I! Oh! I can't do anything! That is the minister's job.' No! no! the whole of us must work at it. Yes, and you too. 'But what could I do?' you say. More than you think. There's a woman coming in; how tired she looks! Couldn't you ask, 'Oh, please God, let her get some of the water. Please God, do!' And there's a man; how old he is! No games for him, just a dull, grown-up life, and dreadfully old at that. Couldn't you ask God to give him something to make up to him a little for being so slow and stupid, with his old stiff legs and old tired feet that can't run any longer? And couldn't you say to God, 'Father dear, here is a foolish little rowdy boy, who is always doing the wrong thing, and always somehow getting into trouble. Help me to be less cross and selfish, and more thoughtful and brave and kind.' And that will come.

Yes: all of us must do our part. You too!

The Soul's Wardrobe.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

'Put on therefore, as the elect of God, holy and beloved, bowels of mercies, kindness, humbleness of mind, meekness, longsuffering; . . . and above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness.'—Col 3^{12-14}.

What a task dressing oneself is! At first, and for a long time, we can't do it. It is done for us. It is done *to* us. Mothers and nurses enjoy doing it, but we don't enjoy having it done. We object. We protest loudly and kick violently, but it's no good. Dressed we have got to be, and dressed we are, and everybody gets some satisfaction out of it, except us.

Then a great day comes: we dress ourselves! We can do it now. How grown-up we feel! But our troubles are far from being over. They are only changed. We are continually being 'dropped on' because we are not properly dressed. 'Johnny, go and change that collar at once; it's not fit to be seen.' 'Elsie, go and put on another frock. You can't possibly go out in that one.' So it goes on.

When we get past these hurdles, we have only a short time of peace, for the task then becomes a problem, the problem of 'what to put on.' It's a problem for girls sooner than for boys, but soon it becomes a very serious matter for boys as well. The choice of ties and socks demands anxious thought! One must wear what the other fellows wear. It's a ghastly business to go to school in slacks when plus-fours are 'the thing.' A boy would rather go to instant execution than be odd in his clothes. Girls, of course, never have 'anything to put on,' 'not a stitch fit to wear.' This really means that they have a wardrobe full of

'stitches,' but they can't make up their minds which to put on.

I wonder if we ever give half as much thought to what our souls shall put on? We ought to: it matters far more. The clothes of our souls are our habits; and, as if we knew that, we borrow the word to describe certain sorts of clothes and talk, for instance, about a riding 'habit.' Other clothes we buy, but these we make ourselves, weaving them thread by thread, by thoughts and words and actions, until a 'habit' is formed; and it is very difficult to put off once it has been put on. We make them as a shellfish makes his shell. If it lives in clean water and sunlight, the shell is lovely with fair colours; if it lives in mud and dirty water, and away from the light, the shell is dark and ugly. And we, too, will have our souls clothed with beauty or ugliness, just as we live and move and think amid the things that are clean and full of light, or among things that are muddy and unclean.

Now the Bible has a good deal to say about what we should 'put on.' It tells us what our soul's wardrobe should be if we are to be well dressed. Listen! 'Put on, therefore, as God's chosen ones, consecrated and dear to Him, compassion, kindliness, humility, gentleness, good temper.'

What lovely soft stuffs! How delightful to the touch! Nothing stiff and starchy about them; nothing rough and humpy; nothing glaring. Their colours are soft and pleasing to the eye. In what graceful folds they fall. They suit every one whose 'habits' they are. To 'put on' these is to have your soul well dressed. 'And over all these,' it goes on, 'put on Love. It is the belt that completes it all.'

That is how our Lord would have His children dressed. So the Bible says, 'Awake! awake! put on your beautiful garments.' You can't buy them like other clothes, nor can you fling them on in a hurry. They must be made, and put on gradually. Every act of kindness, every thought of compassion, every time temper and conceit are controlled and put to silence, a stitch is added to the beautiful garments of your soul, until, like Christ's seamless robe, they are knit into one gracious and seemly harmony.

Get busy, then, with the wardrobe of your soul. Remember this, too, that if your soul is not dressed in these beautiful garments, it doesn't really matter much what clothes you put on your body. The best of them wear out, and go out of fashion; but these things never wear out, never go out of fashion, and are always lovely.

The Christian Year.

Tenth Sunday after Trinity.

The Citizenship of Heaven.

'For our citizenship is in heaven.'—Ph 3^{20} (R.V.).

This text in other times might have been called a pulpit commonplace; now it sounds almost like a challenge. Among all the changes which have come over religious and theological teaching within living memory none seems so momentous as the acute secularizing of Christianity, as shown by the practical disappearance of the other world from the sermons and the writings of those who are most in touch with the thoughts and aspirations of our contemporaries. The modern clergyman need not be afraid of being nicknamed a 'sky pilot.' The New Jerusalem which fills his thoughts is a revolutionized London. As for the appeals to hopes and fears beyond the grave, the scheme of government by rewards and punishments, on which Bishop Butler dilates, they are gone. Our generation will not listen to them. Give us something to help us here and now is the cry. Tell us how to remedy social evils, and especially how to reduce the amount of physical suffering.

Now, whether we sympathize with this change or not, we must admit that it is a very great one. The gospel has never been so preached before. From the time of the first martyrs to our own day the Christian has always felt that this world is not his home; his eyes have been fixed upon the curtain which hangs between us and the beyond through which, as he believed, streamed forth broken gleams of a purer light than ever poured from the sun. In all the changes and chances of this mortal life he has looked for 'the city that hath foundations, whose builder and maker is God.' However pictured, the eternal world has been hitherto for Christians the real world. The only reality which belongs to this present life lies in the mysterious fact that temporal acts have eternal issues, that the purposes of God and the irrevocable destinies of men and women are being worked out in this shifting stage. Are we so modern that this seems unreal to us?

What was the message of Jesus Christ to mankind? How did He judge human life, and what was His estimate of the value of social and economic arrangements? We have been told to distinguish between judgments of fact and judgments of value. The two cannot indeed be held apart, for a fact which has no value is not even a fact but an unrelated and meaningless accident, if such a thing

were possible. And, assuredly, that which has no existence has also no value. But the distinction is sometimes useful, and we may employ it here by saying that the revelation of Jesus Christ was a revelation of human life based upon certain great truths. The essence of Christianity is a transvaluation of all values in the light of our Divine sonship and heavenly citizenship. The first Christians were accused of turning the world upside down. This is just what the teaching of Christ does if the average man sees the world right side up. The things that are seen are temporal, fugitive, relatively unreal. The things that are not seen are eternal; real in their changeless activity and inexhaustible fulness of meaning. Jesus Christ Himself lived in the presence of these timeless realities. He was in heaven, as St. John seems to say, even if He came down to earth. Every joy was for Him a thanksgiving, every wish a prayer. And in so living He knew that the only thing that matters in this world is the life, or the soul, which is here on its trial, passing through its earthly pilgrimage towards weal or woe. Earthly interests He views and judges without harshness, but with an unmistakable aloofness, often expressed with kindly pity and a sort of delicate irony. 'What shall it profit a man if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?' 'Is not the life more than meat and the body than raiment?' The pomps and vanities of this world seem to Him childish. A wild flower is a much more beautiful object than a king or queen dressed up for a state function. How absurd, too, to hoard valuables which will probably be spoilt or stolen, and which in any case divert our attention from heavenly things. He almost laughs at the man who brings Him a burning family grievance to settle.

Now this is a very different attitude from that of the Old Testament prophets who really did throw themselves into social and political agitation. They plunged into the stormy sea of politics. Our Lord walked over it dry shod, as He walked over the Lake of Galilee. The naïve exclamation, 'Blessed is he who shall eat bread in the kingdom of God,' evoked a parable which showed how far such thoughts were from our Lord's mind. The kingdom of God, as St. Paul saw truly, is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost. Christ's kingdom was not of this world; and yet this is the Divine paradox of Christianity: we cannot be saved by resolving to know nothing but God and our own souls. The introspective isolated life is emphatically not the Christian life. Our Lord's detachment from external things was combined with intense interest in the personalities of men and women.

These two sides of His teaching never fly apart in the gospel itself, but all through the history of the Church they have done so continually. The contemplative hermit and the busy humanitarian are both half-Christians, and yet much less than half, because each side is spoiled by its one-sidedness. And the two sides are held together by the teaching and the example of Christ. The proclamation of this gospel was the good news, because it makes the Christian more self-sufficing than the Stoic, without his hardness; more content with simple natural pleasures than the Epicurean, without his propensity to shirk social duties; more of an idealist than Plato, although the better country of the Christian is not allowed to suck the importance and the meaning from the present life; a stricter moralist than the Jew, although the Second Table of the Law is briefly comprehended in this saying, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' Love for the brethren and indifference to the troublesome accessories of life, both alike based on that new estimate of values which in its turn is based on our Divine sonship and heavenly citizenship; what could it not accomplish? And so Jesus left His message to the care of the few simple folk to whom He gave it; left it unwritten; left it undeveloped. All a matter of principles with no rules.

Jesus Christ's standard of values in the light of our Divine sonship and heavenly citizenship is the standard for all Christians. We have been born into a period full of danger and difficulty, a period of transition in many ways, a period which demands men and heroes. It is not a time when any one has a right to lead a life of frivolity, immersed in such childish interests as games and horse-racing. Let us give ourselves time to think, to pray. Let us ask God to show us what things are really valuable and worth striving for, and what things are not. Let us try hard and earnestly to make the eternal world real, and it never will be real unless we try hard to see it. The spiritual eye needs training and exercise as much as the bodily organ. Creatures who live in the dark end by losing their eyes. And do not let us live softly. Let us learn to endure hardness as good soldiers of Jesus Christ; whatever our political or economic theories it must be wise and patriotic to lead a simple life, and it is a very great help to the knowledge of God. And lastly, remember that our Master came not to be ministered unto, but to minister. Mr. Bernard Shaw's definition of a gentleman is one who puts in the common stock more than he takes out. And it

is the way of the Cross ; and Christianity without the Cross is a miserable counterfeit.

Let us, then, sum up by repeating the text, 'Our citizenship is in heaven,' but heaven is nearer to our souls than this earth is to our bodies.[1]

ELEVENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Things that are Not.

'And things which are not, to bring to nought things that are.'—1 Co 1[28].

The subject of this passage—one of the central and supreme passages in the Pauline Epistles—is the Cross of Jesus Christ. To the Jew that Cross was a stumbling-block, for the Jew asked for signs. These signs must be the evidence of power—Divine power, and the sphere in which they must appear was political, national, military—a mighty field-marshal, who by his prowess and skill would break the foreign yoke, and drive the usurper back to his own land. But instead of a world-conqueror the Jew is offered a humble Carpenter ; instead of a throne he is offered a Cross.

The Cross was the symbol of utter defeat, of humiliation, of public shame. The Jew, moreover, was a literalist in the interpretation of Scripture, and to him the Cross was the sign of the anathema of God—'Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.' To the Greek the Cross was foolishness, for the Greek sought after wisdom, and the sphere in which that wisdom must show itself was philosophy—a philosophy of existence and of human life. Instead of a philosophy the Greek was offered a fact—a fact, moreover, that to his mind was meaningless, a fact that to his culture and taste was repelling if not repulsive—a humble Jew dying on a cross. What bearing could that have on the world or on human life ? As a key to the problems of existence the Cross to him was sheer unmitigated folly. 'But unto them which are called, both Jews and Greeks,' said the Apostle, 'Christ the power of God, and the wisdom of God.'

Step by step the argument rises to its climax, and the climax is found in the words of our text. At first sight it seems as if the Apostle in the ardour of his argument had fallen into the rhetorical lapse of an anticlimax, for, if an object does not exist, how can God choose it, and, if it be chosen, but non-existent, how can it bring an existing thing to nought ?

There are three senses, each of them natural and unforced, in which these words may be understood :

1. An object may be non-existent for one person, because he is ignorant of it ; to another person it exists, and is operative, because its existence is known. An object or a force may be non-existent for man ; it may exist for God. Of the discoveries of recent years, the best known forces are Radium, the Röntgen Rays, Wireless Telegraphy. For millenniums these forces have been wholly unknown to man, unused by him. From the beginning they were known to Him by whom they were created. How many elemental forces still lie concealed in the bosom of Nature known only to God, who shall say ?

To the Jew and to the Greek the Cross of Christ, its truth and its power, were non-existent, because they were unknown. That a humble Nazarene was crucified in the reign of Tiberius under Pontius Pilate they would not trouble to question ; but what was there in that ? For any practical bearing that Calvary had on the meaning of the world or of human life it was non-existent. To the Apostle, and to those who believed as he did, Calvary was the crowning event in the world's history—the event for which every previous century was a preparation, and from which every succeeding century flowed as a consequence.

A few years ago the chief inhabitants of Japan were overwhelmed in a great catastrophe—earthquake, volcano, fire. The first helpers to arrive on the scene were members of the Red Cross. That is typical, symbolic. Wherever the need of the human race is most urgent, wherever suffering is direst, there the Cross hastens to its self-appointed task—the task it loves above all others ; wherever tyrannies of evil rear their heads, there the Cross is at work, not with the violence of the earthquake, but with the breath of God's spring, melting the glaciers of the world's winter till they flow down in refreshing streams, and fill the valleys with fruits and flowers.

2. Some things are non-existent because they have not yet come into being. They will be, but they are not yet. The main content of these words in the mind of the Apostle is, doubtless, that which we have already expounded, but this also may well have been part of it. One of these forces, non-existent now, but coming into being, is future generations—men and women still to be born. Future generations are the reserves of God's army. The Church of Jesus Christ is like a succession of great armies. These armies are successive generations—each army advancing a little, then ageing, wearying, fading away, giving place to another. To our minds the progress of the race is painfully,

[1] W. R. Inge in *Anglo-American Preaching*, 3.

pitifully slow. Great sins, national, individual—Drink, Gambling, Covetousness, Impurity—rear their heads as defiantly as ever, and we are tempted to cry, 'How long, O Lord; how long ere the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ?'

In our impatience we forget great truths. To our brief, finite lives a day seems as a thousand years. To the timeless Creator a thousand years are as one day. In our calculations we leave out the Divine essential factor—we leave out God. The Lord God Almighty reigneth. God is righteousness, and the forces of righteousness are omnipotent and eternal. Greater is he that is for us than all they that can be against us. We forget also that God's reserves are not yet in the field—the men and women that are yet unborn.

3. Some things exist potentially but not actually, but the potential may become real.

What potentialities there are in your life and mine! What men and women we might be if every power were fully liberated and energized by the Spirit of God! To believe in Jesus Christ is to believe that the best is yet to be, but the day of life passes quickly, and night approaches, and the question arises—How are the potentialities of life to be realized?

The important thing is vision. 'Where there is no vision, the people perish.' Every life has vision of a kind, but the perspective is too short, too often it is bounded by the horizon of time. Vision in its reality and plenitude is the vision of God; the goal of that vision is the kingdom of God in the world and, first of all, in our own life.

By what means, then, can that vision be caught and kept and become the motive power of our life? By what means does a great artist capture the vision of a perfect landscape he desires to paint? He does not catch it at all. He gazes on the purple hills and the green valleys and the sun setting in golden glory, and the vision captures him and holds him till the skilled hand produces the picture imprinted on the heart. The purest heart cannot capture the vision of God, it can only reflect it, but God captures *it*. The truest, boldest spirit cannot capture Christ, but Christ captures him and holds him in His sweet thrall. And then things happen. The impossible becomes the possible actual; sin withers up in the vision of holiness. The garments of sin are not rent from us—that is beyond human power—they fall from us. The dry channels of the soul are filled, flooded, thrilled with life—and that life is Jesus Christ.[1]

[1] W. Ross, *Till He Come*, 115.

Twelfth Sunday after Trinity.

The Compensations of God.

'Without were fightings, within were fears. Nevertheless he that comforteth the lowly, even God, comforted us by the coming of Titus.'—2 Co $7^{5f.}$ (R.V.).

Paul was tossing on a broken sea of troubles at this moment. Not long before he had been driven out of Ephesus by a riot, and obliged to leave the local Christians in a crisis. He was now anxiously waiting in Macedonia for the return of Titus from a mission to the Corinthian Church, where some Christians had been misconducting themselves. 'Without were fightings'—external attacks upon himself and the Churches; 'within were fears'—concern and heaviness about the faith and behaviour of Christians for whom he felt responsible, especially about those in the south. He found the strain of waiting for his envoy almost intolerable. But one day Titus arrived with good news about the Corinthian Church, and the Apostle's depression was instantly changed into relief and cheerfulness.

What enabled him to ride out the storm? Well, he was fast to three anchors.

(1) He seems to have been turning over one of his favourite chapters in the *Old Testament*. The phrase, 'He that comforteth the lowly,' shows incidentally where he had been looking for courage during the period of strain. It is a quotation from the forty-ninth chapter of Isaiah. Several echoes of the chapter are to be heard throughout Paul's letters, and the reference here suggests that the phrases of it clung to his mind during the time of anxiety which had now closed. Probably he valued the chapter on account of its stress upon the freedom of the gospel for the nations. But what further attracted him was the fact that this was a chapter of encouragement for people who were tempted to fear that their work for God had proved a failure.

Here, then, is one means of holding ourselves open to receive God's compensations. When our surroundings are dumb and contrary we can turn to God's Word. It is part of our equipment for the Christian service and experience to know our way to the great, calm passages of the Bible. We should have our favourite chapters or psalms, and we should have them by heart. There are times when we may have little else to fall back upon for the rallying of our faith.

(2) *Unselfishness* is another safeguard. Sympathy with other people may often seem to carry in its train more discomfort than pleasure. Those who are sensitive to the needs and errors of their

fellow-men, and who endeavour to interest themselves in people who have any claim on them, suffer more than if they were content to be self-centred and indifferent. Yet, if they lay themselves open to anxieties and annoyances, they get compensations infinitely richer than the selfish ever dream of. Paul was thrilled by the good news from Corinth. The better resolves of his friends there sent a glow of unselfish pleasure to his heart. It was his keen sense of responsibility for them which had occasioned him these hours of distress, and it was through the same feeling, which knit him to their interests, that the new happiness arrived. There are people who, as far as possible, deliberately avoid interesting themselves in others and forming ties of responsibility, simply because they shrink from the worries and expense which they anticipate will ensue from such associations. It is sometimes feasible to safeguard life by restricting it in this way. But the cultivation of an easy unconcern shuts out also the finer joys which we cannot have apart from the fuller and heavier responsibilities. There are Divine compensations which never visit the self-centred. There is no room for them to enter when the door is shut upon the duties and demands of human sympathy.

(3) *Moral humility* is another qualification for the experience of God's higher compensations. When Paul speaks of the God who comforts the lowly, he means that it is only the unassuming and humble who can receive this gift of God. It is easy to become moody and bitter when people disappoint us and work seems temporarily useless. We may feel we scarcely deserved to be treated in this way, and resentment against our fellow-creatures may slip into a sullen apathy or a nervous fear that God is not looking after us properly. Sensible people sometimes try to overcome this petulance by dwelling grimly on its absurdity. How unreasonable, they argue, to expect much from human nature! How stupid for puny man to protest against the dealings of the Infinite Power which is over all human concerns. But, if this reading of life cleans out our petty pride, it fails to put in any moral comfort. We need a more Christian view of the situation, and Paul defines it by saying that the only secure position is the humble mind which makes no bargains with God, which realizes that we are God's, here for His ends and not for our own, here as His soldiers and servants.

Even under the untoward discipline we get reminders of His thoughtfulness, if we are careful to notice them. Cowper, who knew from experience the black hours of despondency that occasionally visit life, put the whole secret into the first words of the Olney hymn:

> Sometimes a light surprises
> The Christian while he sings.

The relief of God generally surprises life along that line. It is the cheerful, not the grumbling and defiant, who receive the compensations of God's comfort. Those who are trying pluckily to make the best of things and refusing to let their faith in God break down, those who will fail, if need be, with a smile and a cheer—it is they who are visited by God's rallying encouragements, as they swing with their three anchors out, a memory of God's word, a temper of unselfishness, and a humble, resolute conscience for their immediate duty.

Take, for example, our friendships. Paul realized at this time what an unspeakable solace it is to have a reliable friend. No doubt it was the good news from Corinth which relieved the Apostle's anxiety, but often it is not anything our friend brings which helps us. It is just himself. When we say good-bye to a friend, after he has been sitting with us, we are sometimes inclined to say to ourselves what Paul said about Titus: 'God comforted me by his coming.' He may have said nothing about religion. Perhaps he was unconscious of our special trouble. But his presence, the sense that he is our friend, his power of taking us out of ourselves and making us feel that, after all, we are not isolated units—all this forms one of God's direct compensations to us. We go back to face our life, heartened and uplifted.

'God comforted us by the coming of Titus.' The incident of a friend's visit may be part of God's large providence of encouragement. James Smetham closes a letter with thanks to a friend for writing to him when he happened to be depressed: 'Glad to get your friendly letter. It was like the coming of Titus. I think Providence in these days often sends Titus by post.' But whether our friends rally us by personal intercourse or by correspondence, the great point is to recognize in them one of the Divine compensations. What we must do is to recognize gladly that the moving of one heart to another is the work of God. He it is who prompts these instincts of thoughtfulness and affection and loyalty. It is not by accident that you and your friend come together. The mutual interests, the exchange of thought, the moral stimulus, the close intimacy, the confidence which you enjoy in your friend, the affinities that draw men and women together across differences of age and position, are a wonderful providence.

And they seldom seem so wonderful or so Divine as when they help us, in some difficult hour, to compose our minds and keep our footing.

'Without were fightings, within were fears. Nevertheless'—the compensations of God surprise us on this side and on that. There are good reasons for holding to our faith. Things come together against us, things press on us, we have sleepless nights and anxious days. 'Nevertheless—God!' That is our supreme compensation, God's presence living and moving through it all to rally the dutiful and the devout who are resolved that, come what may, they will on no account surrender. His compensations are abroad and at work on our behalf. Nothing can keep them from us. Nothing in heaven or on earth can hinder their arrival.[1]

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Gehazi.

'And Gehazi went out from his presence a leper as white as snow.'—2 K 5^{27}.

One of the subtlest temptations of Satan is to make a man gain out of his religion. Only the pure in heart, only those who serve God or their fellow-men in simplicity, are enlightened by the true wisdom. And when the spirit of evil, who is the master of all craft and subtlety, can prevail upon a man to mingle his own gain with his public service, whether in the Church or in the State, he troubles his vision. And so Elisha turned Naaman's offer of gifts aside.

His servant Gehazi, student in the school of the prophets, saw the rich gifts his master was refusing. 'Was not the prophet mad to refuse such things!' So he hurried after Naaman and told his story of some poor student who had come, and how his master, though he wished nothing for himself, would yet gladly accept a gift for him. The story was plausible enough. But Naaman needed no coaxing. He urged Gehazi to take more and more—more perhaps than he deemed prudent to take.

But was it worth while?—all the inward fever, the trouble of concealment, the loss of peace and dignity, the shame, and then this leprosy! Sin is a brief madness. The heart pores over some secret passion: it dandles it in the hidden places of the imagination until the values of life are distorted. Then come suddenly the opportunity and its temptation; and then the sin. But after the sin comes the awaking, when the man perceives that he has been a fool and has sold himself for a delusion. Well for him who wakes to sanity, and binds the disgrace of his fall as a memorial unto himself for ever. So he may escape from its bondage.

We see in this story how a good man may destroy himself by a secret vice. When we read it first we may wonder how such a one as Gehazi should be a servant of Elisha. In every company there are to be found weak men with the seeds of disloyalty in them. Men are not cast out of an iron mould; their characters are not fixed and rigid, determined at the start towards good or evil. Our natures are plastic. We are growing, developing souls. Good and evil both have their sources in our hearts. It is a great thing for a man, a blessing beyond estimating, to be of the company of Jesus or Elisha or any great servant of mankind: it is a blessing to have our place set amid the influences of good men and women who are free from any of the passions of our lower nature and live gladly and freely among those pure affections and aims which enrich the soul. A Judas, a Gehazi, have the best chance of being saved from themselves. But there is an inexpugnable core of individual responsibility in each soul, a power of responding to the better or the worse which life throws across their path. And so from out the band of Jesus, where good was present in its loveliest and most persuasive form, the lost soul of Judas comes; and from the service of a high, spiritually minded prophet, a slave of greed like Gehazi.

We may notice these two things:

1. *The Evil of Greed.*—When Dante went on his journey through the circles of hell, where dree their eternal weird all those who have gone astray, he found the avaricious in a lower circle than the sensualists. Now when we think of our great national vices of drunkenness and impurity that judgment may seem strange. Drunkenness and impurity slay their ten thousands in every generation. And in comparison greed seems harmless and innocent. Is it not merely thrift run to excess, and is not thrift a virtue? But that is not what say the masters of man's soul—they who have read wisely in the book of our life and know the results of the passions. They agree with Dante. Turn over the gospel pages and you will find that our Lord said nothing about fleshly sins, but again and again He warned the people against covetousness. And why? because it shuts the ear to the Divine calls. The listener in the crowd who cried to Jesus, 'Speak to my brother that he divide the inheritance with me,' would be amazed at the Prophet's rebuke. Was not his claim just? Did not his brother owe him half the estate? Why, then, should not God's holy Prophet help him to

[1] J. Moffatt, *Reasons and Reasons*, 179.

justice? But Jesus saw the evil that his brooding over his lost property was doing him. It was shutting his ear to the gospel of salvation.

(1) Greed is an anti-social vice and destroys friendliness and neighbourliness in the community. Its spirit makes a man the rival and foe of his fellow-men: it poisons competition which in itself is a good rather than an evil: it turns work and commerce, which ought to be a mutual benefit, into war; it spreads ultimately through a nation the spirit of class suspicion and distrust which is one of the deadliest poisons in the body politic. What is the greatest danger which threatens our nation to-day, the evil that is undermining our prosperity and may send this great creation of many centuries, the British Empire, crashing in ruins? It is the lack of brotherhood in the nation, the class enmity and suspicion which come from the race after wealth on the one hand, and the absorption in better wages with less work on the other.

(2) Greed sterilizes a man's whole soul; it deprives him of the interests which enrich the personality. What are the powers in us which are vital, those virtues and qualities which nourish all our varied talents and swell the stream of joy within? The poet tells us: they are admiration, trust, and love. It is the generous dispositions which make a man of any spiritual richness and worth. Dante tells us that, on his way through the hell of the avaricious, he tried to recognize some of the lost souls there, but he could not. The greed which in their earthly life had won them the scorn of their fellows

Now makes them dim to keenest searching eyes.

That is not a mere poetic fancy. It is the solemn awful fact of their sin's consequence. Greed preys on a man's personality: it drains his life of those enriching interests which make the child of God: and the shut heart and the shut hand become a symbol of the spiritual poverty of the man, his lack of any real individuality.

2. *The Swiftness of the Tragedy.*—One little hour: and Gehazi beheld the gleaming robes and the silver, and covetousness glowed like a hot coal in his heart, the plot was laid and his greed fulfilled: one hour and the doom was on him. And yet it was really no sudden temptation. Men are not tempted unless they prepare their own hearts for the temptation. Naaman spread his gauds before the eyes of Elisha, but Elisha did not regard them. His mind was full of other thoughts, the passion for national righteousness and the establishment of the Divine rule in Israel, and rich robes and rolls of silver were nothing to him. But one glance at the wealth Elisha disregarded made the eyes of Gehazi ache; the conduct of his master in refusing it made his heart sick. For greed had been his companion many a day.

We make our own temptations; we make our own opportunities. These may seem to come from without, chance happenings with which we had nothing to do. But it was not so. They were fashioned by ourselves. The secret preparations of the heart had been travailing with them for long. Life goes on its quiet course, the day's routine, the common work and play. But in the secret recesses of the soul, in the silent converse of the spirit with itself, are growing desires and longings and admirations. The hour comes when these declare themselves. To some, as to Gehazi, it is an hour of shame when the hidden evil is revealed. To some it is an hour of glory: they show themselves in sudden brightness like a man inspired, and their friends are surprised at the spirit which is in them, the courage, the loyalty, the endurance, the rich and rare generosity.

Take heed of thy heart, for out of it are the issues of life.[1]

[1] R. Glaister, *The Beauty of the Lord*, 109.

Time-Measures of the Pentateuch.

By the Reverend A. T. Richardson, St. Boniface College, Warminster.

The first mention of time-measures in the Pentateuch is Gn 1[14], where it is pointed out that computation of time depends upon the observation of the heavenly bodies. 'God said, Let them be for dates and seasons; days and recurrent-periods.' In other words, the sun and moon mark 'time when,' and 'time how long.' The two Hebrew words used here are *yom*, which is always translated 'day,' and *shanah*, which is usually rendered in our version by 'year,' when time is the subject. But this latter word is actually almost the same as the Hebrew word for 'two,' and properly denotes

'that which repeats, or recurs.' Hence, although it eventually became the recognized word for our English 'year,' yet two or three thousand years B.C. it may have been used to denote other recurrent-periods, such as the month, or the season.

The simplest natural measure of time in all ages, and among all peoples, must have been the day; marked by the apparent passage of the sun across the sky from E. to W. We note that either the Hebrew *yom*, or the English 'day,' may stand for either a point of time, *e.g.* Passover, or Easter Day; or for a period measured in hours. Further, this period may be either twenty-four hours, or the duration of daylight; and hence is not a definitely fixed period of time without some qualification.

The next natural measure of time common to all peoples is the period which elapses from new moon to new moon. This is expressed accurately by the Hebrew *khodesh*, and less accurately by the English 'month,' which varies from 28 to 31 days. A more accurate word is 'lunation,' which expresses a period of rather more than 29½ days of twenty-four hours each. In consequence of this fraction of a little more than half a day, it has always been impossible to reckon a month as an exact number of days; and it is equally impossible to reckon an exact number of lunations in the solar year. In Hebrew reckoning, since at least the time of Moses, the lunation has been taken as the standard measure of time. But, since 12 lunations make only about 354 days, they compute the number of years elapsed by inserting a thirteenth lunation seven times in 19 years; in the 3rd, 6th, 8th, 11th, 14th, 17th, and 19th years. Hence the number of days in a Jewish 'year' may be 354 or 384; but it is never 365 days. The necessity for this is a religious one. By the Law of Moses the first month of the *shanah* was the one marked by the new moon near the vernal equinox, which, according to our reckoning, is on March 21 or 22. From this date were computed the set days for the celebration of the Feasts of Passover, Pentecost, and Tabernacles; and this is the origin of the movableness of our festivals of Easter and Whitsunday. But for the insertion of the thirteenth intercalary month, the feast of the ingathering of the harvest would in a few years occur in winter when there is no harvest to gather.

This brings us to another important natural measure of time, viz. the seasons of seed-time and harvest. These are in themselves entirely independent of the length of the month, but they point towards the next longest recurrent-period, which we in England call the year. This is for us the recurrent-period *par excellence*, next after the day. Many centuries B.C. the Egyptian *intelligentsia*, which composed their priesthood, had noted the fact that the round of seasons was marked by the apparent positions of the sun at midday. As the days passed, he rose higher and higher until he reached a point called the summer solstice, then declined day by day until he reached the winter solstice, and then began again to climb upwards in the sky. These positions of the sun could be noted by the length of the shadow thrown by the apex of a pyramid on the flat surface at its base; and notably by that of the Great Pyramid on the plateau of Ghizeh, near Cairo. When the sun was at its lowest midday height, about December 21, the shadow was longest; and it reached its shortest length about the date which we call June 21. Records were carefully kept by the Egyptian priests; and they were able to measure accurately the number of days from solstice to solstice; and eventually evolved the computation of a period called the Sothic Period, the length of which was 1461 of our years. Their calculations formed the basis for the Julian Calendar of Julius Cæsar, the Gregorian Calendar of Pope Gregory XIII., and our present mode of computation which makes the year usually 365 days long, and sometimes 366 days (making a period of 1461 *days*).

For a settled population, dependent on crops for their sustenance, the provision of some sort of a calendar must always have been a matter of importance. In Egypt, where the computation of time had been made a matter of close study, the agricultural population were able to obtain information from the priests as to the dates for sowing their varying crops; no doubt on payment of the proper fees.

A further need in the measurement of long periods is a fixed point of time from which to reckon. Such a point is provided for us by the Birth of our Lord, and gives us our present date of A.D. 1928, which is sufficiently nearly correct for practical purposes. Such a point of time was marked for the Hebrews, or Bene-Israel, by the words 'when Israel came out of Egypt'; but it did not come into general use. For the most part they were content to estimate the number of 'recurrent-periods' of a man's life or of a king's reign. For these recurrent-periods, as we have said, the Hebrew word was *shanah*, always translated in A.V. and R.V. as 'year.'

At the time that the Pentateuch received the final form which it now has, *i.e.* probably about 500 B.C., the *shanah* was either 12 or 13 lunations (that is, it might be 354 or 384 days; and on the

average was about 365 days). But the researches of scholars have established the fact that the final compilation of the Pentateuch was made from much older documents. Can we assert that the recurrent-period indicated by the word *shanah* meant the same number of days in records written one or two thousand years B.C. as it meant about 500 B.C.?

We have already pointed out that the word *yom*, or its English equivalent 'day,' has varying meanings. In computing the longer lapses of time, it implies twenty-four hours; but we have our Lord's expression, 'Are there not twelve hours in the day?' Further, at the present time we can use the same word *day* with two different significations, even in the same sentence. 'It is twelve days since I did a day's work.' We understand the first 'day' in that sentence to imply twenty-four hours; the second use of it may be anything from eight to sixteen hours. In Hebrew, further, such expressions as 'in that day,' or 'the day of the Lord,' cover long periods very different from twenty-four hours. Hence we are not justified in asserting that the word *shanah*, used for a longer period, must always have had one connotation only, and that it must always imply 365 days.

In Stephen's speech (Ac 7^{22}) he has preserved for us the fact that Moses 'was instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians,' which probably includes knowledge of the Egyptian time-measures. But he did not use the Egyptian computations, which would have interfered with his institution of the Hebrew feast-days; rather he modified the knowledge gained in Egypt, and framed his own calendar. The basis of this calendar is the times of sowing and ingathering of the crops; and it is based on what we call the 'natural seasons.' In our latitude these are four—Spring, Summer, Autumn, Winter; and we know the difficulty of deciding when one ends and another begins. But in Palestine and the neighbouring areas there are not four, but two, marked seasons. There is the dry season from May to October, and the rainy season from October to May. In the Book of Psalms and elsewhere these are rendered 'summer' and 'winter.' Either of these seasons might be designated a recurring-period, or *shanah*; and a careful computation of them would give a very accurate record of the lapse of time over long periods.

Now, although the calendar of the Egyptian priests was necessary to the dwellers in the Nile Valley, where rain hardly ever falls, and where there is comparatively little change of temperature to mark seasons, yet to nomad tribes of the desert the Egyptian method of chronology would be of little interest. Further, they had no fixed object, such as the pyramid, whose shadow they could continuously observe. On the other hand, the change from wet season to dry season was ever with them, and invariable. I suggest, therefore, that in the records which told Moses about his ancestors for eight generations back (up to the time of Abraham) the *shanah* or recurring-period would be that period by which nomads reckoned, and that there were two such *shanahs* in what we now call a year. In the times of the kings, when intercourse with Egypt and Babylon was considerable, the Bene-Israel would fall in with a computation of time used by the Great Powers on either side of them. The period of transition appears to have been about the time of the reign of David. We meet with the expression *shanah yamim*, literally 'a year of days,' translated in LXX and our versions by 'a full year.' *E.g.*, in 1 S 27^{7}, David is said to have been in the Philistine country 'a full year and four months,' *i.e.* sixteen months. In 2 S 14^{28}, we find 'Absalom dwelt two full years in Jerusalem,' *i.e.* twenty-four months.

In this transition period, the new meaning of *shanah*, which was being given to a period of twelve months, is thus indicated, in order to differentiate it from the old *shanah* of about six months. But it is evident that the new meaning of *shanah* was becoming normal from the fact that Barzillai the Gileadite is stated in 2 S 19^{31} to have been a very aged man of eighty *shanah* of age.

A survival of the old reckoning is still to be seen. According to the Mosaic Law, the month of Abib,[1] *i.e.* the month beginning about the vernal equinox, was to be the beginning of the *shanah*; and the Feast of Ingathering was at 'the outgoing of the *shanah*.'[2] But down to the present day Jews still observe the *Rosh Ha-shanah*, or beginning of the *shanah*, about September or October. Hence Jews have two New Year's Days in each of our years (*i.e.* about our Easter and Michaelmas).

But now we must apply the test of arithmetic to our theory. The ages of the patriarchs and others at their deaths is given as follows:

Abraham	175 *shanah*	Levi	137 *shanah*
Sarah	127 ,,	Kohath	133 ,,
Isaac	180 ,,	Amram	137 ,,
Ishmael	137 ,,	Moses	120 ,,
Jacob	147 ,,	Joshua	110 ,,
Joseph	110 ,,		

Now, if in all these cases the word *shanah*, at its first writing, meant a *season* of which there are

[1] Ex 12^{2}. [2] Ex 23^{16}.

two in our year, we have ages varying from Joshua and Joseph, 55 years at death, to Isaac 90 years at death, and these we may call normal lives.

There is no indication from Egyptian or Babylonian records that the normal length of human life during the patriarchal period was beyond the threescore years and ten, or fourscore years, of Ps 90, styled 'A prayer of Moses.' Ages at which men married are recorded as follows: Isaac 40 *shanah*, Esau 40 *shanah*. It is more likely that these numbers are six-month periods, than that both these men remained unmarried until the age of forty full years. Again, it is stated in Gn 17^{17} 21^{5} that at the birth of Isaac, Abraham was 100 and Sarah 90. If these numbers denote 'seasons' their ages were respectively 50 and 45 full years. In this case we can understand Sarah's belief that she had passed the critical period, and was unlikely to have a child. But we also know that similar cases do happen. While to be told that Sarah was 90 years old at the time of the birth imposes a strain on our credulity, and to many has seemed to be evidence of the untrustworthiness of the Pentateuch.

Let us now apply this theory to the much-debated date of the Exodus. We read in Ex 12^{40} that the sojourning of the Bene-Israel in Egypt was 430 *shanahs*. Now the genealogy of Moses, as given in Ex 6, is as follows: Jacob, Levi, Kohath, Amram, Moses (five generations). The ages of these men at death are given thus: Jacob 147, Levi 137, Kohath 133, Amram 137, Moses 120; all reckoned in *shanahs*. Also Jacob was 130 *shanah* when he went to Egypt, and Moses 80 *shanah* at the Exodus. Further, Kohath is said to have gone with his grandfather to Egypt (Gn 46^{11}). If the period spent by the Bene-Israel in Egypt was 430 *shanah* (=215 years), it follows that Moses, the grandson of Kohath, was born rather more than 360 *shanah* (=180 years) after the birth of Kohath. This may be shown more clearly if we transfer the dates to more modern times, thus:

	A.D.	
Birth of Jacob (say)	1650	
Birth of Levi	1680	(about)
Birth of Kohath	1710	(about)
Jacob came to Egypt	1715	(aged 65)
Birth of Moses	1890	
The Exodus	1930	(430 *shanah*, or 215 years, after 1715)

This requires that a man (Kohath) born in the reign of Queen Anne had a grandson born in the latter years of Queen Victoria, and cannot support our theory.

But the reading of Ex 12^{40}, in the LXX and Samaritan Versions, is 'the sojourning of the Bene-Israel in the land of Egypt, *and in the land of Canaan*, was 430 *shanah*.' This gives us as a *terminus a quo*, the time when Abraham, the progenitor of the Bene-Israel, came into Canaan.

Taking this as zero year, we get the following dates:

Before Zero.	*Shanah.*	Years.
Abraham born	75	37½
After Zero.	***Shanah.***	**Years.**
Abraham came to Canaan when he was 75 *shanah* (=37½ years) old	0	0
Isaac born (Abraham 100 *s.*, 50 y.)	25	12½
Jacob born (Isaac 60*s.*, 30 y.)	85	42½
Levi born	about 140	70
Kohath born	about 210	105
Jacob came to Egypt (aged 130 *s.*, 65 y.)	215	107½
Amram born	about 270	135
Moses born	350	175
The Exodus (Moses 80*s.*, 40 y.)	430	215

The numbers of these years give us normal periods for the genealogical descent.

Our next important date comes from the statement in 1 K 6^{1}, that the fourth year of Solomon's reign, when the building of the Temple commenced, was the 480th *shanah* after the Bene-Israel came out of the land of Egypt. This brings us to 910 *shanah* or 455 years after zero.

The Exodus is said to have taken place soon after the death of the Pharaoh of the Oppression, who is supposed by many to have been Rameses II., for whom the Bene-Israel built the store cities, Pithom and Rameses; and excavation of the ruins of Pithom has established the fact that Rameses II. was its builder. Sayce estimates the date of his reign as 1348 to 1281 B.C.; H. R. Hall thinks it was 1300 to 1234 B.C.; Petrie gives 1300 to 1234 B.C., and Breasted 1291 to 1225 B.C. Taking the date given by Hall and Petrie, we arrive at 1234 B.C. for the death of Rameses II., and the accession of Meneptah, who has been supposed to be the Pharaoh of the Exodus. If, then, we take 1232 B.C. as the approximate date of the Exodus, we get the following table, always reckoning two *shanah* = one year:

	B.C.
Abraham born	1485
Abraham came to Canaan (aged 75*s.*, 37½ y.)	1447
Isaac born (Abraham 100*s.*, 50 y.)	1435
Jacob born (Isaac 60*s.*, 30 y.)	1405
Abraham died (aged 175*s.*, 87½ y.)	1398
Levi born	about 1377
Kohath born	about 1342

	B.C.
Jacob came to Egypt (aged 130 *s.*, 65 y.)	1340
Amram born	about 1312
Moses born	1272
The Exodus (Moses 80*s.*, 40 y.)	1232
Commencement of the Temple (240 years later)	992

Now H. R. Hall (*Ancient History of the Near East*) gives 975 to 935 B.C. as the probable period of the reign of Solomon; others make his reign to be 990 to 950 B.C.; and Hall says: 'the division of the Hebrew kingdom after the death of Solomon must be assigned to somewhere between 950 and 930 B.C.' If we take the earlier of these dates, our reckoning, based on the Biblical records (but taking two *shanah* = one year), brings us to a date only two years out; and taking the later one, about twenty years out. Whilst taking the *shanah* in these records as equivalent to our year, the chronology of Genesis, as has been shown by Driver, has no historical value.

We have now to consider the period covered by the books of Joshua and Judges. First we note the frequent occurrence of the number 40 *shanah*, or its multiples. This would appear to be the next longest Hebrew period of duration, and represents a 'generation'; *i.e.* the normal period from birth to manhood. Hence 40 *shanah*, 80 *shanah*, 480 *shanah* imply one, two, or twelve generations. Now we can hardly suppose that in early days a 'generation,' or several 'generations,' were any more accurate and exact than is our expression, say, 'three centuries ago.' This is taken to mean *about* 300 years.

The crossing of the Jordan took place about 40 *shanah*, or 20 years, after the Exodus. Moses died at the age of 120 *shanah*, or 60 years, while his eye was still undimmed and his bodily strength in full vigour. This is a natural remark to be passed on many a man of 60, but not on one of 120. Joshua died at 55, and he was a young man about the time of the Exodus. We shall probably not be far out if we put the date of his death at about 1197 B.C.; 35 years after 1232 B.C.

The periods of the rule of the Judges, and of the foreign invasions, are given as follows:

	Shanah
Invasion of Cushan-rishathaim	8
Othniel judge	(no period stated)
Eglon's invasion	18
Ehud judge	(no period stated)
Shamgar judge	(no period stated)
Jabin's invasion	20
Barak judge	(no period stated)
Midianitish invasion	7
Gideon judge	40
Abimelech, Tola, Jair, judges	48
Philistine invasion	18
Jephthah, Ibzan, Elon, Abdon, judges	31
Philistine invasion	40
Samson judge 20 *shanah* of this period.	
Samuel judge till his death.	
Saul, king in Samuel's lifetime.	
	230

This gives us 230 *shanah*, or 115 years, up to the end of the Philistine invasion.

In addition we have the following periods of rest:

	Shanah
Othniel's time	40
Ehud's time	80
Barak's time	40
Gideon's time (already reckoned)	
	160

This gives us 80 years, but it is doubtful to what extent they overlap the periods of the rule of the judges. But adding both together we get 115 plus 80 = 195 years, from the death of Joshua to the death of Samuel. Adding 20 years for the reign of Saul, and 40 for that of David, we have about 255 years from the death of Joshua, or 290 years from the Exodus, or 942 B.C., for the commencement of Solomon's reign. This is about 50 years too long, but is as near as we can expect, having regard to the imperfect data and probable overlapping; and very different from the length of time demanded when the *shanah* is taken as one year.

One or two points may be noted in conclusion. If our chronology is approximately correct, Abraham came into Canaan just about the time of the death of Thothmes III., who had subdued the country, but whose successors for about a century left it in peace. The Pharaoh who promoted Joseph may have been Ai, the successor of Tut-ankh-amen, or the next Pharaoh, Horemheb. The Pharaohs of the XIXth Dynasty begin with Rameses I. (about 1321 B.C.); and according to the Biblical record Joseph died about 1317 B.C. (He was 32 *Egyptian* years old when Jacob came to Egypt, and died at 55.)

During the reign of Rameses II. and his father Seti I., Palestine was brought under subjugation to Egypt, but their successors do not appear to have interfered with it much. Consequently it offered an easier prey to the Bene-Israel than might otherwise have been the case.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

Professor Eissfeldt of Halle has written a sketch,[1] at once attractive and comprehensive, of the lifework of the late Professor Graf Baudissin, whom British students who studied under him at Marburg or Berlin will remember with gratitude. Eissfeldt, while fully acknowledging Baudissin's power as an exegete and as textual and literary critic, regards him as pre-eminently an historian of religion, especially of Semitic religion; in this he was a master, and in certain branches of it, notably in his knowledge of Phœnician and Aramaic religion, he was without a peer. All his other studies were subservient to this, and it is one of his many merits that at a time when most Old Testament scholars were studying the Old Testament chiefly from within, he was liberating it from its isolation and linking it up with Semitic religion in general. For this task he was admirably qualified in three directions: (i) by his unusually wide and accurate knowledge of the Semitic languages and literatures; (ii) by his subtle native sympathy with the modes of ancient religious thought and feeling; and (iii) by his own profound interest in religion. His own deep piety was controlled by the two ideas—so characteristic of Semitic religion—to the investigation of which he may be said to have devoted his life, God as Lord, and God as Life. Eissfeldt's sketch is a most sympathetic revelation of Baudissin's mind and work, and it is good to know that to the scholarly author of this sketch has been entrusted the task of editing Baudissin's work, which he had completed in manuscript before his death, on 'Kurios as Divine Name in Judaism and its Place in the History of Religion.'

Curiously enough, though Israel throughout the Old Testament regards herself as an elect people, the basis of that conception never seems to have been thoroughly discussed. Dr. Kurt Galling, addressing himself to this question in a valuable monograph,[2] argues that there are really two lines of tradition—one which connects it with the Exodus, and the other which traces it back to the covenant with the patriarchs. The former, powerfully represented by the prophets, runs through the whole of the Old Testament from the song of Miriam right down to the Maccabæan psalms; the latter is represented chiefly by the narrative documents on which the Pentateuch rests. Apart from the Pentateuch, this emphasis upon the patriarchs is sporadic and late, though the significance of 'Father Abraham' increases with the centuries. Galling argues that one of the aims of the historians, notably J and E, was to strengthen and encourage in the people of Israel and Judah a sense of their real unity. The unity, precariously sustained during the reign of David, was definitely ruptured in the reign of his grandson, and J and E attempted to heal the breach by linking up the various tribal traditions, and tracing back to a common ancestry the traditions of the various sanctuaries at which the national God had revealed Himself, on the principle that one God and a common patriarchal ancestry should have as its political corollary one people. The prophets, Galling argues, shared this belief: why, then, when they had occasion to touch on the election of Israel, did the pre-exilic prophets at any rate ignore the patriarchs of whom the historians make so much and throw their whole emphasis upon the Exodus? Because—so runs the answer—with their supreme regard for ethical interests as the true sphere for the expression of religion, they sternly disapproved of the contemporary worship in the sanctuaries, whose origin was traced back to the patriarchs—a worship which created an entirely false conception of the relation of Jahweh to Israel and of the real nature of His demands. The ideal time was the time of the Exodus, when, according to Amos and Jeremiah, there was no sacrifice.

This is an acute discussion, raising fresh points of much interest and importance.

The address which Professor Hans Schmidt delivered last September in Oxford at the meeting of the Society for Old Testament Study is now presented in expanded form.[3] In this he argues—with happy translation of most of the relevant passages, chiefly from the Psalter—that we have in the Psalter prayers of persons falsely accused of some crime (*e.g.* theft, cf. Ps 7^4 69^4), in such a process as is hinted at in 1 K $8^{31f.}$ and illustrated by the Elephantine papyri in the case of Malkijah.

[1] *Vom Lebenswerk eines Religionshistorikers* (Wolf Wilhelm Graf Baudissin), von Otto Eissfeldt (Verlagsbuchhandlung von F. A. Brockhaus, Leipzig).

[2] *Die Erwählungstraditionen Israels*, von Kurt Galling (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk.6).

[3] *Das Gebet der Angeklagten im Alten Testament*, von Professor Hans Schmidt (Töpelmann, Giessen; Mk.2.70).

There are occasional references in the Psalter to prison (cf. 142^{7}), and probably more than appear in our English translation, which contents itself with 'distress'—references which strongly suggest that the singer has really been accused, arrested, and imprisoned; later in the Temple he maintains his innocence by calling down a curse upon himself (cf. 7^{5}) if he is speaking falsely. In some of the psalms (cf. 38) the person accused is sick, his sickness being construed by his accusers as evidence of specific guilt; for example, of compassing some one's death by means of magic (cf. Ps 109). There are many interesting textual suggestions scattered throughout the discussion, of which perhaps the most significant is to read for לִבְקֹר (E.VV. 'to inquire') in Ps 27^{4}, בַּבֹּקֶר, 'in the morning,' which brings the psalm into line with other references in the Psalter (7^{15} 57^{8}) to the morning, when the psalmist's innocence would be vindicated.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Glasgow.

Professor Brunner of Zürich has already made himself known as no mean representative of the so-called 'Dialectic School' of theology, and his two recent books will add to his reputation. The first of these is a booklet on the Philosophy of Religion in the sense in which such a thing is to be understood by an Evangelical Protestant.[1] To Professor Brunner the Philosophy of Religion as a comprehensive science whose concern is the exhibiting of the 'essence' of religion common to all religions is impossible for the Christian faith. The singularity, or individuality, or specific nature of the Christian revelation is the very antithesis of any religious 'greatest common measure' so sedulously sought after by philosophers and theologians of rationalistic, idealistic, or mystical temper. If the Christian is to take any note of the philosophy of religion it can only be as a part of Christian theology, that part that we in this country would call apologetics. Professor Brunner knows quite well that he has knocked a very cherished idol off its pedestal, and in justification of his action he argues (1) that he is but returning to the position of the first Protestant Reformers, and (2) that nearly all the religious philosophers and theologians since their day have been in error (*e.g.* Schleiermacher, Hegel, Ritschl, Troeltsch, and Otto). The work of these men, however, is not entirely useless, and what is good in it Professor Brunner shows at length how it may serve to give precision to the significance of the Christian revelation, and to explain in what way this same revelation may be personally experienced to-day by means of the Bible without men becoming slaves to its letter.

Professor Brunner's other book is a much larger work.[2] Its theme is the great one of 'The Mediator,' which Jesus our Lord can only be if there is any real substance in the asseveration of Christian faith that He is the unique and absolutely decisive self-disclosure of God to men. Professor Brunner's volume falls into three main parts. The first deals with the opposition against and the justifications for faith in the 'Mediator.' That faith he considers is implacably opposed by the modern mind and emasculated by all modern theologians who draw their inspiration from Schleiermacher, Hegel, and Ritschl. As long as the distinction between general and specific revelation is denied or flattened out, and as long as the modern mind is convinced that there is no distance or fact of separation (like objective sin in the world) between God and man but may be overcome from the human side, Jesus will not get His right name, 'Mediator,' but something lower, after the manner of the pet phraseology of these days, 'Genius,' 'Hero,' or 'Personality,' as the conceivable maximum of moral and spiritual life. The second part, proceeding from the position that sin has put an absolute barrier between God and man which cannot be overcome from the human side, has as its subject 'The Person of the Mediator.' Philosophers and theologians with their passionless Absolute notwithstanding, God does come to the help of sinful men who cannot themselves come to Him, and that coming constitutes the 'Mediator.' This Divine Initiative, the Eternal Son of God becoming man is not the same as the man Jesus attaining in His life and within human history to Deity. Not Christ after the flesh, but Christ after the Spirit, a non-natural and a non-historical fact—that is the concern of Christian faith. This existence of God Himself as Christ in human life, Professor Brunner stresses, is not 'supernaturalism' in the sense that it is a surd in the world. It is simply and inscrutably there in the mystery of the Person of Christ, and in faith's apprehension of it an order of reality and experience which as such has nothing to do with Nature or with history—a point of view which underlies all Professor Brunner's polemic against the modern mind and theology as

[1] *Religionsphilosophie Evangelischer Theologie*: Sonderausgabe aus dem Handbuch der Philosophie (R. Oldenbourg, München; 1927. 100 pp.; M.4.80).

[2] *Der Mittler: zur Besinnung über Christus-glauben* (Mohr, Tübingen; 1927. 565 pp.; M.14.40).

well as his refusal, *e.g.*, to rest his Christology upon the Virgin Birth or upon the Empty Tomb. From the Person of the Mediator Professor Brunner passes to a consideration of 'the Work of the Mediator' in the third part of his volume. The coming of the Eternal Son of God is His work. Person and work are one, the existence of the Mediator is itself redemption. In face of what sin is both for God and man, there are grave obstacles to reconciliation on both sides, and these the Mediator overcomes by breaking the guilt and power of sin, by bearing the punishment sin involves, and by satisfying the righteous indignation of God, who as personal spirit cannot but be angry at man's demeaning of His holy will and love. The price of sin must be paid, is paid by God, and thus it is that the Cross (as lying eternally upon the sorrowing heart of God) reveals the absolute holiness and the absolute compassion of God in one. So it is that Christ and not history is the Mediator, who as the Divine Person, and not as a principle, enables us to know ourselves as we really are, and who as King of His Church and through it gives the reality and power and achievement of God to human history which otherwise is only a fruitless phantasmagoria. From these words it will readily be admitted that Professor Brunner's book is vital and richly rewarding to the interested reader. It is indeed discursive as its author recognizes, and some of its judgments, historical and philosophical, are open to serious question. It has, however, a great service to render, not a little of which will be in the bringing of this question to a point of decision whether or not the faith of the Church catholic and the modern mind are fundamentally contradictory.

In Professor Wobbermin's pamphlet the reader will meet with a Greatheart who has taken to his sword to deal with the dialectic theologians.[1] Professor Wobbermin seeks to show that the opinion about Schleiermacher and Ritschl, prevalent before the late war, that they were safe champions of the evangelical faith is still fully justifiable. Taking as his text, so to speak, Luther's word that 'Faith and God go together,' our author argues that Schleiermacher and Ritschl were true to that word. Recognizing the real presence of God in Christian experience, they were believing analysers of the human side of that experience, differing merely in their methods. Both were good children of the Reformation, and faithful to Luther's insight into Christian faith. Indeed, their catholic pedigree may be said to extend further back still, even to the great St. Thomas Aquinas himself. Valuable, therefore, as the polemic of such men as Barth and Brunner is against all views that would stamp the soul of man with subjectivity and history with relativity, it ought not to be possible for them to say that Schleiermacher and Ritschl are the fathers of the devastating psychologism and historicism of some modern theologians. It is more than probable, however, that neither Professor Wobbermin nor his dialectic fellows are entirely right, but that the keener instinct for the issues involved is with the latter.

[1] *Schleiermacher und Ritschl in ihrer Bedeutung für die heutige theologische Lage und Aufgabe* (Mohr, Tübingen; 1927. 44 pp.; M.1.50).

It is also a pleasure to call attention to Professor Bornhausen's recent work.[2] This book, occasioned by a desire to help men to-day amid the confusing and disabling views about history, urges that the right name for Christ as a truly historical Person is 'Saviour.' It is the only word that keeps before us the whole fact of Christ, reminding us that He belongs to two worlds, to the human and to the Divine side of reality. In consideration of this theme the book falls into three sections, historical, philosophical, and dogmatic, where the Hellenic, the Judaic, and the Egyptian notions and cults of salvation are appraised, the philosophy of redemption within Christendom evaluated, and the content and contribution of Christian redemption as understood by the evangelical faith set forth. 'Evangelical faith is faith in Jesus Christ as alive within the historical environment of our lives. The Saviour is alive, not in the Mass, not in Ritual, not in Dogma, but as an historical fact in the history of every soul, and in this consists at once the reality and the limits of the redemption brought about through Jesus Christ.' Professor Bornhausen is a theologian of idealistic heritage, who is keenly aware that Christology is now as never before the central question of Divinity. His book is also vital, finely written, wide enough in its sweep to take note even of tiny Scotland and her theological children, and outstanding for its satisfaction of the prevailing preferences, and some would say the putrifying prejudices, of our untheologically minded modern world.

R. S. Sleigh.

Glasgow.

[2] *Der Erlöser: seine Bedeutung in Geschichte und Glauben* (Quelle und Meyer, Leipzig; 1927, 258 pp.).

Augustine's 'Soliloquies.'

By the Reverend W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D., St. Mary's Hospital, Ilford.

The period of Retreat between Augustine's Conversion and his Baptism was partly devoted to discussions with his pupils and friends, and partly to his own private reflections. The discussions were taken down in writing and afterwards expanded and published. These discussions throw considerable light on Augustine's religious development. While they instructed his hearers, they also expressed his own outlook, and helped to clear his mind. More intimate, however, than these writings were his private reflections, which are recorded in the treatise called 'Soliloquies.'

The 'Soliloquies' will not compare with the Confessions. That famous masterpiece was not written until after thirteen years of experience of life as a Christian. In richness of thought and human interest, in theological depth and devotional maturity, the Confessions altogether eclipse the earlier reflections. That is what might naturally be expected. The 'Soliloquies' are the utterance of one who is in a state of obvious transition, one who is beginning to realize great ideas but has by no means as yet fully assimilated them. The book reads like the work of a novice, a wonderful novice indeed, but yet a beginner, whose great capacity shows that, if he lives, a marvellous development lies before him. The peculiar value of the 'Soliloquies' lies in the fact that they were not written years after the event like the Confessions, but in the freshness of actual experience, and therefore they fix the precise stage which Augustine's religious and theological progress had achieved in the interval between his Conversion and his Baptism.

The 'Soliloquies' are cast into the form of a Dialogue between Augustine and Reason. It is significant that this is the first historic use of the term 'Soliloquy.' It is probable that Augustine originated the word.

He begins with a long out-pouring in prayer, in which we find the first flight of that devotional spirit afterwards matured in the Confessions. We know that previously to his Conversion he had prayed. He has recorded among other prayers his anomalous petition that the grace of self-control might be postponed. After the Conversion he records that both he and his pupils prayed. Here, however, in the 'Soliloquies' the pent-up spirit of devotion seems released, pours out in a perfect flood. The name of God is uttered and repeated again and again, like the dominant theme of some mighty fugue; and each repetition develops some fresh aspect, some new idea, some hitherto unmentioned glory of Deity. The Holy Name is reiterated with what would be monotony, but is redeemed from monotony by the inexhaustible abundance of the thoughts which it awakens. God is conceived as Creator of all that is (*universitatis conditor*). Then also, God is Father of Truth, Father of Wisdom, Father of Blessedness, Father of the good and beautiful; so that Fatherhood becomes the ruling idea.

It is a singular fact that, while obvious allusions occur to our Lord's utterances, our Lord Himself is nowhere mentioned by name, still less is any petition directed to Him. At the same time, in this prayer Augustine alludes to the Christian doctrine of distinctions within the Deity. He speaks of a nature 'ubi qui gignit, et quem gignit unum est' (*Soliloq.* i. 4). Here the distinction of the Father and of the Son within the Divine Unity is clearly indicated; but in terms which maturer knowledge corrected. For 'unum est,' he said, read 'unum sunt' (*Retractations*).

The signs are unmistakable that Augustine has now advanced far beyond the god of philosophy to the god of religion. It is no abstract Deity which is now the object of his contemplation, but a personal Being with whom he is in intimate fellowship and communion. The God of the 'Soliloquies' possesses all the characteristics of personality. God is for Augustine at this stage of his religious development the Being whom all love who are capable of loving, whether consciously or unconsciously. To go forth from God is to die, to return is to revive, to dwell in Him is to live.

Already Augustine addresses God as One 'Whom no one loses unless deceived; Whom no one seeks, unless aroused; Whom no one finds unless purified' (i. 3). Already he uplifts his soul in the fervid strains: 'Hear me, hear me, hear me, my God, my Lord, my King, my Father, my Creator, my Hope, my possession, my glory, my home, my country, my salvation, my light, my life.' Already he can say: 'Thee only do I love, Thee only follow, Thee only seek, Thee only I am ready to serve.'

The doctrine of Grace had already been accepted

in a still earlier writing. Augustine had already rejoiced to find his friend Alypius admitting the necessity of Divine help for the discovery of truth (*C. Academ.* iii. 13). But here in the 'Soliloquies' the dependence of the human will on Divine co-operation is made the basis of a very earnest appeal for strength: 'Order, I pray, and command whatever Thou wilt, but heal me and open mine ears, that I may hear Thy call. Heal me, and open mine eyes, that I may see Thy guiding. Drive folly far from me, that I may discern Thee.' Here we have anticipations of the famous language of the Confessions: a profound consciousness of inability apart from Divine enlightenment and support. 'If they who take refuge in Thee find Thee by faith, give me faith.' He prays that God will increase in him both faith and hope and love. For the writer of the 'Soliloquies,' God is the source of strength.

And further, in this prayer there occurs the note of penitence. This has been sometimes denied. Nevertheless, it is distinctly there. Not, of course, uttered with the intense and profound self-reproaching of the Confessions. Twelve years of converted life greatly deepened his sense of sin. The Bishop did not speak like the Neophyte. But, when Augustine calls on God to cast madness out from him, to receive His fugitive; when he sorrowfully acknowledges that he has been the plaything of deceptions, and served God's enemies; surely the note of penitence is unmistakable. And it is important to insist on this. For Neoplatonist Philosophy had no room for penitence. This strain of self-reproach was not derived from philosophy. It is the product of a study of St. Paul.

As has been already said, the 'Soliloquies' are cast into the form of a Dialogue between Reason and Self. But, however dominant the part of Reason may be, Augustine is convinced that Reason alone is not competent to determine spiritual realities. There is a moral qualification required. The eyes of the soul are able to see, when the soul itself is pure from every fleshly stain; that is, when it is purged of every mortal desire. Until that condition is reached faith is indispensable. Faith must come first. On this necessity of faith Augustine lays much stress.

Indeed, in the 'Soliloquies' he has already become familiar with the trio of Christian graces—faith, hope, and love—and has come to appreciate their place in religious progress. All these are needful for the health of the soul.

Augustine subjects himself to a severe self-examination concerning his motives. He is now aged 33. He asks himself whether his mind is set on money-making. He can say that for the last fourteen years he has ceased to be disturbed by that passion. Cicero's book Hortensius had taught him that wealth should not be an object of pursuit, but that if it came it should be administered with the highest caution and prudence. All he wants is such income as a free man requires for his maintenance.

He asks himself next about ambition. He confesses that until quite recently he was dominated by the longing to acquire honours and distinctions. There was a glamour about worldly success which fascinated him. But he is now able to say that this ambitious passion has passed.

Then he asks himself about marriage. He replies that for himself he neither seeks nor desires it. In a characteristic passage he said: 'Whether the procreation of children was part of the function of the wise, which at present he was not able to say, he might concede that any person who entered the married state for this purpose only, was to be admired but not imitated. For its dangers were more plain than its blessedness.' It is only fair to remember that the writer of these words was the son of a mixed marriage, and the witness of a father's disorderly career. While his early experience does by no means altogether account for the austerity of his estimate—for certainly the Monastic ideal had captivated him—yet his home life probably affected his judgment more fully than he was aware. At the same time, Augustine's transparent sincerity compelled him to acknowledge that his ideals did not as yet altogether correspond with his inclinations. He is in a very emotional state in these 'Soliloquies,' and is deeply humiliated by his inconsistencies.

In this merciless self-analysis he owns himself greatly disturbed by three chief apprehensions—the fear of loss, the fear of death, and the fear of pain.

He questions himself about his reasons for fearing the loss of friends. Why does he desire that they should live with him? His answer is in order that they may together seek after God and acquire knowledge of their own souls. He admits that if their friendship proved a hindrance to the attainment of wisdom he would desire to avoid it.

As to the fear of Death, could he rest assured that whether in the body or out of it, here or elsewhere, he could equally well attain to Wisdom, he would have no such fear at all.

As to the fear of pain, he considers that physical pain is the greatest evil. For the greatest good is

the best of the better part, and the greatest evil the worst of the worse part. Now wisdom is the best thing in the soul, and pain the worst in the body.

Augustine reflected in his 'Soliloquies' that, while the certainty of being immortal would indeed be great, yet it would by no means satisfy. It is also essential to know what sort of immortality it would be. What if immortal life was of such a kind that it allowed you to know nothing more than you already knew? To that question Augustine replied that if that were so he would weep his life away. The capacity for progress is essential to man's immortality.

Thereupon follows an inquiry into the nature of Truth. A subtle line of reasoning is propounded. There is such a thing as Truth. That proposition appears to him indisputable. But if there is, Truth must exist somewhere.

It is characteristic of the great writer's deeply religious spirit that before proceeding much further he turns again to prayer, a brief but extraordinarily comprehensive prayer: 'God Who art always the same, let me know myself, let me know Thee.'

Resuming, then, this discussion about Truth, Augustine argues that it is impossible to deny that there is such a thing as Truth. Some things at any rate are true. Either the world will perish or it will not perish, and if it perishes it will be true that it has perished. Truth, then, cannot perish. But this Truth—where does it reside? If the Mind which observes Truth ceases to exist, what has become of the Truth which existed in the mind. Truth is relative to consciousness. The proposition is ventured that the world cannot exist apart from man. Consequently, it dawns upon the thinker that he is making progress toward belief in the soul's immortality, on the ground that mind is required for the preservation of Truth. At the same time Augustine has misgivings. For the world is never without minds who retain the Truth, not because of their immortality, but because of their succession. Still it is boldly reasserted that the objects on which we gaze depend on us for their reality, and when we have gone they must cease to exist if no other human beings remain to contemplate them. That which does not appear to some intelligence or other must be considered not to exist. Nothing can be true unless it appears.

Once more Augustine turns from reasoning to devotion. 'O God our Father Who dost exhort us to pray, and dost grant what we ask, if while we ask we live better and become better: hear me struggling in this darkness, stretch forth to me Thy right hand. Send out Thy light, recall me from wanderings. Guide me to return to myself and to Thee. Amen.'

After much discussion on dreams and seductive resemblances to reality and deceptions, which are explained as tending towards existence to which they are unable to attain, it is asserted that what is inseparable from its subject cannot survive if the subject dies. And the conclusion is reaffirmed that the reality of Truth requires the permanence of its recipient. Hence it is thought that the nature of Truth becomes an argument for man's immortality. 'If everything which is in the subject persists for ever, the subject itself must, of necessity, persist for ever.'

The imperishable nature of Truth involves the immortality of its recipient. God and the soul remain, because Truth is in them. And, adds Augustine, 'no man doubts concerning the immortality of God.' Truth cannot die. Therefore we shall not doubt the everlasting continuance of the mind. Knowledge is in the mind, and physical death cannot cause the mind to perish. If it could, then Truth could perish, which is impossible.

There are several singular features about these 'Soliloquies.' One certainly is the mingling of metaphysics with devotion: or rather the fact that the whole reasoning is pervaded by a deeply prayerful spirit. Again and again the reasoner pauses and takes refuge in prayer. Augustine has already realized the necessity of grace: the helplessness of the human soul to ascertain the Truth without enlightenment and purification which God alone can give.

Another characteristic of the 'Soliloquies' is the place assigned in reaching Truth to the Christian qualities of faith, hope, and love.

By far the most remarkable feature of these 'Soliloquies' is that Augustine here propounds the theory of idealism. Truth and Thinker are correlative. Truth has no existence apart from mind. The existence of the thing seen depends upon the seer. In propositions of this nature we have the elements of Berkeley's theory already expressed. We find Augustine conscious of the weakness of his inference that the permanence of Truth requires the permanence of the human mind which contemplates it. He raises the difficulty that the permanence of the individual is not thereby established. May not the required condition of the permanence of Truth be satisfied by the succession of human individuals? But the curious thing is that Augustine apparently does

not face the question—Where was Truth before man existed? He speaks distinctly of the immortality of God, which he says no one disputes. But he nowhere suggests that the home of Truth is the eternal mind of God. He is so intent on arguing for human immortality that he does not dwell on the fact that the conditions required for the permanence of Truth are completely fulfilled and satisfied in Deity.

The 'Soliloquies' in their devotional sections are full of Scriptural phrases which reveal how much Augustine has been reading the New Testament, and how familiar he is already growing with its language. Already he speaks of God leading us into all Truth, opening the door to those who knock, giving us the Bread of Life, and the living water which causes us never to thirst again, and of God convincing the world of sin, of righteousness and of judgment, God through whom we are not in bondage to weak and beggarly elements. All these allusions and quotations are crowded into a narrow space, and instructively show how extensive the range of Augustine's Scripture reading has already been, and also the authority which he already assigns to them. All this by no means necessarily involves a clear apprehension on the Neophyte's part of the dogmas which lay behind them. But they certainly prove the direction in which Augustine was moving, and the great advance he had made from a purely philosophic position.

If the form in which the 'Soliloquies' are cast seems to assign a very high place to the Reason, yet a careful study of the book makes clear that Augustine realizes that Reason by itself is not adequate to bring the soul to God. He is conscious that much, very much, depends upon the Will. 'I know not,' he says, 'how any rational demonstration of God could satisfy me: for I do not believe that I know anything as I desire to know God.' In other words, the spiritual quest for God demands the entire personality: the Will just as certainly as the intellect. Indeed, Augustine seems to emphasize Will rather than intellect. For he says, 'I have nothing else than my Will.' Thus the great writer rises above the mere intellectualism which was the bane of the previous attitude towards Religion.

Contributions and Comments.

Ephesians iv. 20, 21.

'But ye did not so learn Christ; if so be that ye heard him, and were taught in him, even as a truth is in Jesus.'

JESUS is (rightly deemed) a 'truth' (*i.e.* in common and less exact parlance a 'science': for truth is a correspondence between words and a reality or existence, and the sciences present these existences to our minds and express our conceptions of them); so that St. Paul is fully justified in speaking of learning *Christ* and being taught *in* Him. Yet I would rather say this truth is 'in Jesus' than 'in Christ,' as, though beautiful in the theory and the abstract, it is more beautiful and intelligible in the concrete and the revelation. Even if the above use of ἀλήθεια as a technical term is of the nature of a ἅπ. λεγ., I claim consideration for the above interpretation as best suiting the passage. If it has already been suggested I can only say it suggested itself to me independently.

I should be very glad to learn whether such a use of ἀλήθεια has any parallel in classic or κοινή literature. Among many 'truths'—history, geography, botany, astronomy, mathematics (including Euclid, called after its leader in thought), and ethics—the leading 'truth' is that which is St. Paul's theme and life. (This is St. Paul's apology for the strong expressions 'learn Christ,' 'be taught in him').

F. J. BRIGGS.

Barbados.

Proverbs xix. 23.

'The fear of the Lord (tendeth) to life,
And (he that hath it) shall abide satisfied,
He shall not be visited with evil' (A.V.).

THE kind reception accorded to my 'Textual Discoveries' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES has encouraged me to add a few subsequent emendations, intended to illustrate the present unsatisfactory condition of the text, and, if possible, to show that this disgrace to scholarship can, in very many instances, be removed, though at the cost of

almost limitless patience. The present passage, for example, did not reveal its secret in time for inclusion, and not till after more than twenty attempts at rectification.

That the passage cannot be otherwise than seriously corrupt is evident from the strange transition from the abstract 'fear of the Lord' to the personal 'he,' a transition effected by the quite illegitimate insertion of the words 'he that hath it.' If all the interpolated words be removed, it will be sufficiently evident that there is something very wrong with the text:

'The fear of the Lord to life, and (he) shall abide satisfied, he shall not be visited with evil.'

And yet the Revised Version, and many later editors, have been content to assume that there is no need of correction.

The first suggestion to be made is based on the frequent error, incidental to the scribes, of dropping a letter, which happens to be preceded by the same letter. This has happened twice in the above sentence. The first letter which has thus suffered is an *aleph*, and its restoration turns 'the fear of the Lord' into 'he that feareth the Lord' (ירא את יהוה).

The second instance is the disappearance of an *ayin*, the final syllable of the preceding word 'satisfied' ending with this letter. The phrase 'abide satisfied' is highly suspicious, though it has passed muster with generations of editors. Now the *ayin* takes its proper place, the word ילין ('shall abide') disappears. Its first consonant *lamed*, becomes the second letter of the preposition על (the preposition regularly going with the verb פקד, 'visit').

But what of the still remaining *nun*? Quite obviously it goes with the two letters which follow it, and נבל ('godless') takes the place of בל ('not').

One more change must be made, but not one involving any consonantal alteration. Instead of לחיים (which has been pointed as 'to life') read לחם ('bread'). This suggestion is confirmed by v.[13] of the next chapter, where we read 'thou shalt be satisfied with bread.'

This proverb now yields its secret of comfort and of warning:

'He that feareth the Lord shall be satisfied with bread;
But evil shall be visited upon the godless.'

Let this be compared with the traditional version, defective both in meaning and grammar, and the improvement is unquestionable. Surely it cannot be for the credit of inspiration that it should be made responsible for what is so obviously unworthy and clumsy. The very fact that such an emendation is possible makes it highly probable.

MELVILLE SCOTT.

Castlechurch, Stafford.

Entre Nous.

Is 53[3] and Ph 2[9].

The Rev. Hobart D. McKeehan, B.D., Minister of the Reformed Church, Huntingdon, Pennsylvania, had a fruitful idea when he decided to publish side by side a sermon by five representative American preachers and five representative British preachers: *Anglo-American Preaching* (Harper Bros.; $1.75). For he is right in thinking that the 'English have much to teach their American brethren, albeit the American has no less to teach his brethren in England.' Mr. McKeehan says he has listened to most of the outstanding Protestant preachers of Britain and America. His choice on this side lies with the Dean of St. Paul's, the Bishops of Durham and Birmingham, the Rev. Vernon Storr, and the Rev. Leyton Richards, Minister of Carr's Lane, Birmingham. It will be noticed that Mr. Richards is the only representative of the Free Churches. We believe that it will be of interest to readers to compare two of the sermons, making the contrast more complete later by purchasing the volume. The first sermon in the volume is by Dean Inge, and we have given it in shortened form in 'The Christian Year.' It might be contrasted with Dr. Dwight Hillis' sermon. The other four American preachers chosen are Dr. George Angier Gordon, Dr. Joseph Fort Newton, Dr. Lynn Harold Hough, and Dr. Frederick Franklin Shannon. Dr. Dwight Hillis suggestively takes the two texts, 'He was despised and rejected of men' (Is 53[3]), and 'The name which is above every name' (Ph 2[9]), and he gives the sermon the title

'Verdicts of History Reversed.' Numerous illustrations abound of verdicts which have been reversed at the bar of history in art and literature. 'In Paris the Salon refused Rodin's first model of the "Thinker," and urged the sculptor to stick to his brick and mortar; but Rodin was not a hod-carrier. Now he ranks with Phidias and Michael Angelo. Holland did not know her greatest painter. On a winter's day Rembrandt took a painting to the burgomaster. The rich ruler scoffed at the canvas, but offered the painter a gulder for a loaf of bread. The time came when Holland paid 100,000 gulders for that rejected canvas.' So men have reversed their verdict on the character and career of Jesus. Dr. Hillis gives as an example Jesus' method of control. 'Many leaders, some states, certain races, still believe in battleships, bombshells, lyddite, poison gases.' But Jesus proposed to rule society by the omnipotence of great ideas. 'His first great idea was, man is the son of God, and therefore must be free. His second idea was the equality of the classes, Dives the patrician and Lazarus the beggar being alike the sons of God. His third great idea was the equality of the races, Jew, Greek, and Roman. His fourth great idea was the equality of the sexes, for the fishermen and the group of women were alike the architects of the new state. . . . That there might be no misunderstanding at the very outset in proposing his new society that was to be ruled by his ideas of justice and love, Jesus put at the forefront His symbol, "I am the light of the world" and "Ye are the light of the world." Light, revelator of things hidden. The light, stimulator of things latent and sleeping, the light, the disinfectant of things diseased and evil. His influence—it works in society as leaven works in dough. His grip upon society is strong as steel, but soft as silk. . . . We understand omnipotence only when we study gravity and watch the sun silently lifting many tons of water from the ocean into the clouds. Silently and secretly the light lifts the sap, creates the forest and the harvests. Secretly and silently, through ideas, Jesus builds a new soul, a new society, new states. There are many hard problems involved in stopping criminals and selfish rulers by force and war, but when a long time has passed, and men have thought their way to the bottom of the question, they will reverse their verdict of contempt and decide that Jesus was right. The only way to control men and States is through great ideas and the guiding principles that can control men as gravity guides the plants and stars in their flight through space.'

Another suggestive idea of Dr. Hillis is that it was by an alliance with the poor that Jesus launched His revolutionary programme. Why did He choose the poor? First, Dr. Hillis says, because they were the neediest class; secondly, because they were in the majority; and thirdly, because the great thinkers and leaders have come from the ranks. For it is poverty that forces men to climb the hills of difficulty. 'Every one of the world's greatest three painters and greatest three sculptors began in poverty. The history of the great authors, whether historians, philosophers, or poets, is the story of an early struggle with adversity.'

Conversion.

Every week the readers of 'The British Weekly' have been stirred by an article from the pen of Quo-Usque on such various subjects as Marriage and Morality, The Next War, The New Press, Politics and Progress, and The New Preaching. Seventeen of the articles have now been reprinted, with the title *Have we Lost our Way?* (Hodder & Stoughton; 3s. 6d. net). We quote from the chapter on The New Preaching:

'"Surely," said an ex-chairman of one of our denominational unions to me a few years ago, "surely you don't believe in conversion?" I replied that I was driven to believe in it, for I had seen the incredible thing happen. I have seen a waspish virago become a perfect dear. I have known men, converted in the Salvation Army, who from the very dregs of the gutter rose to be leaders in social and Christian crusades. I have listened to the stories of men converted at the Water Street Mission in New York—men who had spent years in jail, men who in their despair had tried to drown themselves in the river and who for twenty years and more had been clean, honest, happy citizens.

'Now the preachers of a couple of decades ago used to expect conversions, preach for them, and get them. The modern preacher does not seem to expect conversions; he has ceased to talk about them, and he would be rather embarrassed if they occurred.'

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE restless march of Biblical science is continually springing fresh surprises. Conclusions in which we had begun to settle comfortably are being challenged by new discoveries or new interpretations of familiar facts, and many 'assured results' are being rudely shaken. The critics have recently compelled us to reconsider the date of Deuteronomy and the origin of the Psalter—matters on which twenty or thirty years ago there was comparative unanimity; and now comes the turn of Deutero-Isaiah.

Or rather 'the Second Isaiah'; for, with the magnanimity of true scholarship, Professor C. C. TORREY, of Yale University, in his recently published *The Second Isaiah: a New Interpretation* (T. & T. Clark; 15s. net), confesses his preference for the simpler name, 'inasmuch as the prophecy belongs to the man in the street quite as truly as to the scholar in his study.' By Deutero-Isaiah we used to understand the whole of the latter part of the book, from ch. 40 to ch. 66, till Duhm taught us to confine the term to chs. 40 to 55 and to regard chs. 56 to 66 as a separate work written in the century after the Exile, within which the earlier chapters fall. This is the now generally accepted position, the only point at issue being whether the last eleven chapters should be regarded as an original literary unit or a collection of fragments.

Now Professor TORREY comes upon the scene with a 'new interpretation' which shatters to pieces the prevalent conception of the origin and meaning of the book. He has found it necessary, he tells us, 'in every chapter to controvert the views now universally accepted, showing their inadequacy and explaining the author's intention.' In his 'Ezra Studies,' published eighteen years ago, Dr. TORREY showed his quality as an admirable Semitic scholar with a challenging mind and a more than usually unconventional outlook, and his new book is marked by the same freshness and audacity of treatment. A scholar who can assign the building of Nehemiah's wall to 384 B.C. (p. 110) and the Book of Ezekiel to 230 B.C. (p. 101) does not lack courage. The same courage and originality are evidenced in his treatment of the post-exilic age, which he refuses to regard as an age of decadence and degeneracy. 'The period was one of steady advance, not deterioration, in culture, literature, and religion. . . . This was the golden age of the national poetry, as well as of prophecy' (p. 89).

Besides breadth of scholarship and freshness of mind, Dr. TORREY brings to his task a fine literary sense and a keen appreciation of the literary qualities of the book, alike on its technical and its deeper side. There is a truly refreshing chapter on 'Reconstruction by Meter and Strophe,' in which he holds up to ridicule the liberties which Old Testament scholars have often taken with the text, emending, supplementing, rewriting it, in accordance with views of Hebrew metre which are

often anything but certain and may even be false.

The peril of emending poetry on the basis of too rigid ideas of the principles governing its metrical demands is illustrated by a finely satirical reconstruction of 'Crossing the Bar,' accompanied by some amusing mimicry of the argumentation commonly employed by critics. Subjected to this treatment, the third verse emerges thus :

> Twilight at first, and evening bell,
> And after that the dark !
> And may there be no sad farewell,
> When I at last embark.

This is more than clever ; it is illuminating.

Without appreciation there can be no true criticism, and Professor TORREY also brings this indispensable quality to his discussion. He can scarcely find terms strong enough to express his admiration for 'the Second Isaiah,' whether as poet or prophet. He is 'the greatest prophet of the ancient world' (p. 218), 'one of the greatest men of antiquity' (p. 39), 'also a born poet, and in his own sphere he is supreme and unrivalled among the great poets of the world' (p. 91). His book is not only 'beyond question the greatest and most original specimen of Hebrew poetry, or of Hebrew prophecy, that has come down to us' (p. 52), but 'the greatest single poetical work of any age' (p. x), and 'a landmark in the history of human thought' (p. 134).

Obviously a man so equipped as Professor TORREY with scholarship, historical sense, literary feeling, and religious insight has a right to be heard when he challenges current critical opinion. He challenges that opinion at every point. He does not believe that chs. 56–66 should be separated from chs. 40–55, but that together, prefaced by chs. 34 and 35, they form a homogeneous whole, issued at one time and in one volume, and composed in the order in which they now stand. He does not believe that the so-called 'Songs of the Servant of Jahweh' are independent and separable from their context, but that each is 'part and parcel of the chapter in which it stands.' Above all, he does not believe that even chs. 40–48—still less chs. 49–55, which contain no direct or indirect allusion to Cyrus, or to any particular land of exile—were written in Babylon in the sixth century B.C., near the close of the so-called 'Babylonian exile' (540 B.C.), or that they have for their principal themes the glorification of Cyrus, and the Return of the Jews from Babylonia to Jerusalem.

This, it will be admitted, is a sufficiently drastic challenge. What he does believe is that the Second Isaiah composed these poems—all of them, chs. 34 f., 40–66—'not long after the year 407 ; we may take for convenience the round number 400 B.C.' (p. 109) ; that they were written in Palestine, presumably in Jerusalem, at a time when the Second Temple had long been in existence and the people were there maintaining the ancient forms of their cult, however unworthily and half-heartedly; and that 'the people whom he addresses are in their own land, and there is in his words no hint that they, or any portion of them, have ever been anywhere else' (p. 53).

As we call to mind the definite allusions in the prophecy to Cyrus and Babylon on which the case rests for the Babylonian origin and the date about 540 B.C., we stare with astonishment and ask on what authority evidence so palpable is to be dismissed. It is in his treatment of this point that Professor TORREY goes his entirely new way. He believes that all these allusions are later interpolations—the allusions to Cyrus in 44^{28} (which is in any case admittedly an overloaded verse) and 45^{1}, and the allusions to Babylon and Chaldea in 43^{14} 48^{14} and 48^{20}. Undoubtedly the excision of Babylon and the Chaldeans greatly improves and clarifies 43^{14}, which Dr TORREY renders, 'For your sake I will send and bring all the fugitives, exulting, in their ships'—the reference to the 'ships' (which many scholars needlessly emend) suggesting that the Jewish exiles are not in Babylon, but in places from which they could return to Judea by sea. In point of fact, it cannot be denied that more than once the people are represented as settled all over the world, in the east, west, north, and south

(cf. $43^{5f.}$). In other words, it is the later Dispersion, not the Babylonian exile, that the prophet has in view, and the most fitting description of him is 'the Prophet of the Dispersion.'

This is the calamity which had brought dismay to every loyal son of Israel—not the deportation of a few thousand Jews to Babylonia, but the dispersion of the nation to the four corners of the world, with the consequent danger of its assimilation to idolatrous practices and of the frustration of Israel's mission. The prophet is really combating the threatened dissolution of Israel.

But the reason which makes it certain that those proper names which point so definitely to a Babylonian origin are intrusions is based on metrical considerations: the suspected words interfere with the metre. In 45^{1}, for example, the word *l'Kōresh* (*to Cyrus*), on which our whole interpretation of the Second Isaiah turns, is metrically superfluous, as a glance at Cheyne's edition of the Hebrew is enough to show. So argues Professor TORREY; and for the same reason the other proper names fall under the same suspicion.

There can be no doubt that this argument compels a reconsideration of the problem of the book. It is also strengthened by the fact, on which Dr. TORREY justly enough lays stress (p. 42), that explanatory interpolations do undoubtedly occur elsewhere in the Old Testament: for example, in Is $7^{17.\ 20}$ 'the king of Assyria' is a manifest intrusion. But two considerations give us pause. It is surely unfortunate when interpreters feel themselves obliged to tamper with the received text of a word which is crucial for the interpretation of the passage: this justifies the hesitation in accepting Duhm's brilliant emendation of 'Chaldeans' in Hab 1^{6}, by which the prophecy is transformed into a denunciation of Alexander the Great. And, again, Dr. TORREY himself admits that 'the first principles of Hebrew metric form are not yet thoroughly understood' (p. 82). In that case we may perhaps be permitted to suspend our judgment.

Dr. TORREY, however, does not rest his case merely on the fact that the 'Cyrus-exile' element is, as he puts it, 'dabbed on' (p. 40), but on the far more important consideration that, if Cyrus be retained, the message of the prophecy seems to be involved in inextricable confusion. That message, broadly, is that God's glorious purpose of salvation for the world is to be realized through His Servant, who is primarily Israel but possibly also some great representative of Israel. It happens, however, that phrases are applied and a mission ascribed to Cyrus which are elsewhere applied and ascribed to the Servant. Are we to suppose, then, that Cyrus is the Servant? 'The confusion,' argues Professor TORREY, 'is intolerable. We are faced with an alternative. God's chosen instrument, the centre of this whole prophecy, is either Cyrus or Israel; it cannot possibly be both.' We confess we do not find this argument entirely satisfactory. Why may not Cyrus be the instrument through whom Jahweh enables Israel, through her deliverance from bondage, to win an overwhelming experience of His power and saving purpose, like that which their fathers won at the Exodus, an experience to which the prophet recurs again and again?

The thing of central importance, however, which constitutes the Second Isaiah 'a great landmark in the history of the world's religious thought' (p. 118) is his emphasis on the inclusion of the whole Gentile world, side by side with Israel, in the family of the One God. This is the 'new thing,' according to Dr. TORREY, which the prophet repeatedly professes to announce—not the historical emancipation of Israel from Babylon, but the salvation of the Gentiles through the ministration of the Servant; and this is the real consummation of the eternal purpose of God, initiated historically in the call of Abraham ($41^{8f.}$) and achieved through His Servant. No such magnanimous programme had ever been published before.

But who is the Servant? This is the question uppermost in the minds of all students of the Second Isaiah, and the chapter in which it is discussed is not likely to convince those who are firmly per-

suaded that the Servant in the so-called Songs, as in the prophecy proper, is to be interpreted collectively. The use of the term 'Servant,' Dr. TORREY admits, is perplexing, and the figure is not always the same; it is sometimes the personified nation, sometimes Israel's personal representative. Of the existence of a personal leader as distinguished from the group Dr. TORREY has no doubt. 'Out of this personification of the ideal Israel of the future there emerges the figure of a great leader, the Anointed One. Such a teacher and champion there must be, the future is unthinkable without him.' But if the First Isaiah in 1^{26} could conceive the future without such an individual leader, may not also the Second? At any rate, if we put a personal interpretation on the 'Servant Songs,' it seems easier to believe that they are not from the hand that wrote the body of the prophecy, where the interpretation must be collective, than that Songs and prophecy are from the same hand and that the figure of the Servant changes.

But whatever criticisms may be made on Dr. TORREY'S book in detail or as a whole, it is a splendid challenge to contemporary critical opinion. In the exegesis which follows a very careful translation, and which covers nearly half the book, he justly claims to be contributing 'much that is totally new.' There are many points both in the exegetical detail and in the broad discussion which scholars will not be slow to challenge. But they will gladly recognize that here is the work of a master who can think for himself, who has stirred fresh problems, and who has made a notable contribution to contemporary Biblical scholarship.

The story of the Unjust Steward has always been a crux in New Testament exposition. The traditional interpretation, that Jesus was commending prudence in religion, offends many people. And numerous efforts have been made to give the story another turn. The latest of these, by Mr. Frank LENWOOD, appears in the current *Congregational Quarterly*, and it is certainly original.

Mr. LENWOOD echoes most of the objections that have been made to the ordinary view. Is it probable that Jesus would have drawn a lesson of the need for holy prudence from a story in which the arresting impression is one of fraud? To which one might answer, Why not? Presumably Jesus meant to say, 'If only you would put as much thought into your religion as a business man puts into his business, even a bad business man into a bad business, you would make a greater success of it.' And why should not Jesus say that? The honesty or dishonesty is irrelevant.

Another criticism is that it is improbable in the extreme that the master who suffered from a fraud would give it praise. Again, Why not? Can we not imagine a master smiling ruefully as he considered how he had been 'done,' and saying, 'Well, he's a clever beggar; if only he had turned his talents in the right direction he would have done well for himself.' And notice, the steward is not let off. He receives his punishment. The master says, 'Well, he's smart; but he must go through with it.'

A drastic criticism is also made on the doctrine implied in the story, that the wise use of money here can make it easier for us in the hereafter. 'No use of money can give heaven. . . . Can the friends who have profited by your use of wealth open to you the hospitality of heaven? Is not that God's business? To unlock the heavenly doors you need His invitation, not merely that of the recipients of your past bounties.'

To this the answer is surely very plain. In the Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus, which follows, the whole point is just what is objected to in our present story, that the proper use of wealth, or the abuse of it, made all the difference to the Rich Man's future. As a doctrine this may be objected to, but that it is our Lord's teaching, not only in the Unjust Steward but elsewhere, is beyond question. Why, then, cavil at it here? Jesus teaches clearly that our conduct here determines our future happiness. Witness the Parable of

the Talents and the great discourse in Mt 25, and often elsewhere.

A last criticism is concerned with the verses Lk $16^{10ff.}$ which are appended to the Parable. This is not really a difficulty about the Parable, because they may easily have been added by St. Luke himself. But the objection that the words about faithfulness in little and in much are irrelevant does not seem formidable. Why should not Jesus have said, 'Here was a man who was unfaithful to his trust; you at any rate are not to be like that'? The real difficulty, however, is that this is not the point of the story. The story commends prudence in religion, not faithfulness. And it is quite likely that St. Luke added the words on his own account.

Mr. Lenwood, however, feels the difficulties mentioned almost insurmountable, and he suggests another reading. The Parable is really a criticism of Pharisaism. The Pharisees were God's stewards. Fearing a loss of power and anxious to hold their followers, they made concessions as against the strict law such as involved an immoral cheapening of God's demand. Jesus ironically praises them because at such manœuvres they are so much nimbler than the real children of God.

The Parable was not addressed to the disciples. God is the master and His demands are heavy. So heavy are they, according to the Pharisaic code, that human nature offers a passive obstruction. In face of this it was increasingly difficult for the Pharisees to hold their position. And in facing this difficulty they did what all legalists do—they made dispensations and offered accommodations in order to retain power for their system.

Jesus was aiming His criticisms at the elaborate fabric of Jewish casuistry, of which we have many examples in the Gospels. The Sabbath law and the law of Corban are good instances. The result was a moral confusion which obscured real moral values. What Jesus says therefore to the Pharisees is this: 'He was a prudent fellow, that bailiff, and so are you! We who live by the light of God cannot keep up with you there. But your accommodations depend on a betrayal of the demand of God and are a denial of your stewardship.'

The difficulties in the way of this interpretation are very obvious. For one thing, it is too subtle. You have to strain your mind to carry it through. For another, it is quite hopeless on this view to give any reasonable interpretation of verse 9, 'Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when it shall fail they may receive you into eternal tabernacles.' And, finally, St. Luke tells us the story was told to the disciples, not to the Pharisees.

In the analysis of the scientific and the religious attitudes contained in Mr. Carl Rahn's recent book on *Science and the Religious Life* (reviewed in another column) there is a chapter on 'The Control of Psychophysiological Processes' which may be of interest to the Christian expositor. Having indicated that control of experience and of our behaviour depends on our knowledge of the usual stimulus for a given response, and becomes still more certain when we know also the general conditions that tend to raise, or lower, the threshold for the release of the given response, he goes on to say that the records of the religious experience, especially in the later stages of culture, are found to offer, besides theologies and cosmologies, suggestions towards a technique of psycho-physiological control.

We have been so preoccupied with the theological and cosmological implications of the religious experience that we have been apt to lose sight of this material. Yet it exists in rich abundance, and constitutes a field that awaits proper scientific investigation. The insight into the principles of psycho-physiological functioning which it reveals will often be seen to anticipate our contemporary scientific accounts. Nor is it surprising that this should be so when we consider how mankind has concentrated upon the spiritual quest, and in particular upon the development of personality and character through self-discipline.

For example, the psychological bearing of the practice of fasting, so frequently recommended in ancient days, is often completely missed. The evidence shows that fasting tends to limber up the mental processes and to allay the neuro-muscular tensions, and thus to create conditions which might give a chance for a new mode of psychophysiological functioning. Indeed, fasting might affect not only the individual's perception and judgment, but also his organic reactions and his overt behaviour. 'These implications of our contemporary scientific knowledge of fasting might, if we were so minded, lead us into some sort of intellectual appreciation, if not of the objective of the spiritual quest, at least of the *rationale* of one of the means that have sometimes been proposed for its attainment.'

Again, the religious traditions and records under consideration indicate much in the way of concrete knowledge of the factors that condition the affective or emotional life. Thomas à Kempis may be said to reveal a profound insight into the interrelationships of psychological and physiological processes in his instructions to the neophyte, based on the text in 1 John, 'Perfect love casteth out fear,' a text which may be regarded as offering a significant piece of knowledge of an empirical sort. For it implies not only a qualitative difference between the 'adrenalistic' state of fear and the 'anabolic' state of love, but also a functional opposition between these states. And it is only in recent years that 'the possibility of the existence of well-defined anabolic mechanisms operative in certain emotive states is being envisaged psychologically,' and much of the envisagement is as yet one-sided.

Or consider such a counsel as 'Love your enemies.' Taken in its purely outward meaning, it does not always receive the approval of common sense; and yet it builds on a firm physiological basis: the body is poisoned by hatred and its energy is wasted in anger. In thus pointing to the control of the 'catabolic' states and to the release of the 'anabolic' reaction, this counsel indicates the possibility of remaking the human individual at the physiological centre of being, namely, 'at the point of those organic processes whose functioning determines the life of values and attitudes, of desires and purposes.'

Or consider such an instruction as 'Be still.' Just as the practice of fasting looks beyond inhibition of certain physiological processes, so this instruction looks beyond arrest of the mental life. To put to rest the questioning of the mind is no mere negative process. 'It may arise spontaneously in the individual, as in certain forms of religious awakening, or it may be inaugurated by him as part of a technique of control; but however brought about, the elimination that it involves of the state of secondary attention with its many foci and with its conflict of many impulses, apparently constitutes a condition for inducing widespread modification of mental and bodily processes.'

All this may be vaguely put and difficult to understand. But it is interesting to notice this correlation of religion and science, and that both religion and science may be regarded as pointing in the direction of the possibility of some radical psychophysiological change in our humanity.

'I desire mercy and not sacrifice' (Hos 6^{6}). This short, sharp sentence is among the most significant in the Bible. In it we may find *a motto for the teaching of the Hebrew prophets in general.* Two views are held by students of the Old Testament as to the relation of the prophets to the customary worship. Some say that they condemn worship and sacrifice, and would away with all religious symbols. Others say that they condemn worship and sacrifice only if these are regarded as a substitute for practical piety. In the one case the prophets appear in the rôle of destroyers, of abolitionists; in the other case in the rôle of reformers.

Whatever the truth of the matter may be, on this we may be quite clear—that the prophets look to the moral sphere of character and conduct rather than to the ceremonial sphere for the expression of the true spirit of worship. The obedience which

God requires is not the outward obedience of ceremonial worship and piety, but rather the inward obedience of hearts and lives dedicated to His service. The sacrifices in which God is well pleased are justice and mercy and a humble walk with God.

But in the incisive utterance before us we may also find *a motto for the teaching of Hosea himself*. For the word translated 'mercy' (חֶסֶד) is Hosea's favourite word. Its primary meaning is love Divine, the love of God for His people; that is, according to Hosea, the love shown by God to Israel in the time of her espousals, when, finding her like grapes in the wilderness, like the first-fruit on a fig-tree in its first season, He chose her for Himself from among all the nations of the earth, leading her safe out of the house of captivity and bondage, and through all the wanderings of the wilderness, into the land of promise. And to Hosea's mind that primal love of God for His people was an earnest and token of God's unchanging love.

This great truth of the unchanging and unceasing love of God was borne in upon Hosea's soul—to adopt the usual interpretation of his obscure story—through a dark and bitter passage of experience. The bride of his choice, in whom he had hoped to find his dearest sanctuary on earth, proved herself unworthy and untrue. She returned at length to her lovers. But he found her again, and took her back—'a lily torn and trampled in the mire'—to his heart and home. And this experience of his, all grievous as it was, provided him with a clue to the character of eternal God. As he had loved and cherished Gomer, so the Lord had shed His exceeding great love upon the nation of His choice; and as he had sought Gomer out and redeemed her from her degradation, so the Lord still longed for His faithless people of Israel, pursuing them continually with His gracious favour.

Although Hosea's fundamental thought of God's love for His people is the primary meaning of חֶסֶד, this is obviously not expressed in the verse under consideration. But it gives fulness and richness of content to the derivative meanings that there receive expression. There the word translated 'mercy' means love to God and love to man; and, in Hosea's conception, love to God and love to man are inspired by God's own love. When Hosea bids his countrymen offer the sacrifice of love—of love to God and man—it is unto Him who for ever seeks, unchangingly and unweariedly, to draw them to Himself with the bands of love.

We may also find in the verse before us, if not the key-note, at least *a dominant note of our Lord's teaching*. In this matter of the relation of the ceremonial and the moral His standpoint was the general standpoint of the prophets. The true worship of Him who is Spirit is worship in spirit. And in fulfilling His prophetic mission our Lord found it needful, like the prophets of old, to raise His voice against merely formal religion. Never did an Amos, an Isaiah, or a Micah lash his countrymen more mercilessly than did Jesus the Pharisees of His day, those blind guides, those whited sepulchres, that generation of vipers.

And further, while our Lord's teaching was in line with the general teaching of the prophets, it had special affinity with the teaching of Hosea. Twice it is recorded in the Gospels that our Lord bade the learned Pharisees go and learn the meaning of the Scripture, 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice'; that is, according to our interpretation, 'I will have love to God and man and not,' or, 'rather than sacrifice.' And the evangelistic record of our Lord's conversation with one of the scribes is almost like an exposition of this Scripture, 'Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God, and there is none other but He; and to love Him with all the heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love one's neighbour as himself is more than all whole burnt-offerings and sacrifices.'

It should be easier for Christians than it was for Israel of old to obey the injunction of 'mercy,' that is, of love to God and one's neighbour. Israel had a Hosea, no doubt, to tell her of the Divine

love, and even in his life to reflect it. But Christians have One who in His own Person reflects or reveals the Divine love truly and completely. That was a great sentence of St. Augustine's—great in its simplicity: 'It was mainly for this purpose that Christ came, to wit, that man might know how much God loves him; and that he might learn this, to the intent that he might be enkindled to the love of Him by whom he was first loved, and might also love his neighbours.'

Leaders of Theological Thought.

Karl Barth.

By Professor H. R. Mackintosh, D.D., Edinburgh.

The present-day movement in theology which evokes the deepest interest, alike in friend and foe, is incontestably that associated with the name of Professor Karl Barth. Especially in Germany the controversy is acute.

Barth was born at Basel in 1886 as son of the theological Professor Fritz Barth, known to a former generation as author of a useful book, *Die Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu*, 1903. He went to school in Bern, then studied in the Universities of Bern, Berlin, Tübingen, and Marburg (he speaks of Herrmann as 'my unforgettable teacher'). In 1908–9 he acted as assistant to Dr. Rade, editor of *Die christliche Welt*; for two years thereafter he was Vicar of the German Reformed Congregation in Geneva, and from 1911 to 1921 he held the pastoral charge of Safenwil, Canton Aargau, Switzerland. In the winter of 1921 he was called to Göttingen as Professor of Reformed Theology, and since 1925 he has occupied the Chair of Theology in Münster, Westphalia. Barth is a Swiss, and the movement led by him is often described as 'the Swiss School.' Other prominent members of it are Professor Emil Brunner of Zürich, Dr. Gogarten, and Dr. Thurneysen. But in the present short article we shall limit our attention to Barth himself.

'It always embarrasses me a little,' Barth has said, 'to hear people talk so seriously of *my theology*.' It consists, he urges, simply in a point of view. He will not attempt to rival the systematic efforts of thinkers like Ritschl or Troeltsch, but will merely insert a marginal observation, propose a corrective, utter a warning cry. The line of ancestry to which he wishes to belong goes back through Kierkegaard, Luther and Calvin, Paul, Jeremiah. The name conspicuously absent here is that of Schleiermacher. To him Barth is definitely hostile, on the ground that he conceals men's sorest troubles, part of which is their very religion, and that he confuses God and man—in theology the unpardonable sin. Man and his universe are an enigma. 'Over against him stands God, the Impossible confronting the possible, Death life, Eternity time. The solution of the enigma, the answer to the question, the end of the existential trouble is the absolutely new event that the Impossible as such becomes the possible, death becomes life, eternity time, God man.' The theme of theology is not the deification of man but the incarnation of God. We only theologize as we speak of God. Orthodoxy had its faults, but at least it never forgot this fundamental truth; it knew, at all events in principle, what is superfluous and what is vital. We have to submit our minds, as theologians, to the essential voice of the Bible, where in His Word God reveals Himself in a final authority before which we can only kneel in the dust. 'Let God be found true, but every man a liar.' We are playing with the subject unless we fix ourselves upon the scriptural view of God as Creator and Redeemer and hear in the Bible His very accents. Others abide our question, but to God we cannot say 'Why?' Every chapter in Dogmatic, like every sermon, should bear the inscription, 'God speaks,' and *what* He speaks we discover sufficiently and exclusively in the Bible. Its truth has 'the self-evidence of the Revelation which God gives synchronously to the Biblical witnesses and to His people who receive their testimony.' They receive it by the Spirit's impulse. Theology is lost when it steps outside this 'living circle of Scripture and Spirit.'

Barth perhaps gives us less help than we might desire in distinguishing what is the voice of God from what is not. He relates the alleged Divine revelation inadequately to conscience, and takes

pleasure rather in using the strongest language to affirm that man's proper attitude in listening to God's voice is prostrate and abject. But did not true prophets in the Old Testament appeal to God's righteousness in their conflict with the false? In other words, they found and they applied an ethical test. The prophet ascribed to God the highest content of his own consciousness.[1] In the parables, *e.g.* that of the Prodigal Son, our Lord encourages us to do the same. This defect in Barth is connected with his absolutist view of the Old Testament, which he more than tends to equate with the New. Each part of Scripture is pure and perfect Word of God. We must study it, of course, with all the instruments of scholarship; but we have misread unless we discover in it not man's thoughts about God, but God's thoughts of man. Scripture is theocentric. 'What stands in the Bible is a new world—God! God's rule! God's glory! God's incomprehensible love! Not human history, but Divine history. Not human virtues, but the virtues of Him who has called us out of darkness into His marvellous light. Not human standpoints, but the standpoint of God.' Our one duty, as we read it, is to confess that God is right and we men always in the wrong. If theology accepts its simple duty of speaking out the Word of God—impossible as that duty may be for mere men—it will never be tempted to become, as Romanticism made it, nothing better than a phenomenology of the religious consciousness.

Barth's most famous book is a commentary on Romans. It exhibits not a trace of purely historical interest or philological precision; it seeks only to pierce the historical transparency and reach what is spiritual, super-historical, transcendent, to make everything present and urgent, to hear what God is saying to men to-day out of the Epistle. Barth has no use for the specifically modern sort of exegesis which, as he holds, has turned the Bible into a collection of fascinating antiquities. Whereas what makes the Bible is its exclusive interest in God—Creator and Redeemer, Beginning and End, Origin and Goal of all things. Theology must imitate Scripture here. It too must concentrate solely upon the eternal and transcendent God dimly visible through the veil of history, and if it does so, its affinity with all philosophical thought that is conscious of its own real meaning will be seen. Theology of the right kind is never simple; how could it be, when it is the stammering despairing effort of temporal minds to declare the Everlasting? 'Barth,' says an admirer, 'strides along clad in a scientific terminology which is hard, intricate, and every way exacting, one which at first (and even in many points for long) leaves the impression of oracles and speaking with tongues.'

His theology has been called 'dialectic.' By this is meant that if the proper subject of theology is God's relation to man, this baffles direct and unambiguous description. We cannot apply the loved modern principle of 'continuity' and speak as if God were just the superlative of man, man and something more. Affirmations about God can only be made in contradictory and paradoxical terms, by contrasts which cancel each other yet make each of them its contribution to the expression of truth, by positives which are relieved by negatives that in turn have to yield place as the mind is thrown out at the infinite object. We need this broken, mobile, many-dimensioned thinking, the name for which is 'dialectic,' if we are to bear witness to the truth. (No more than witness-bearing is permitted us; to utter the truth is for God alone.) Position and negation have perpetually to be related to each other. 'We can only speak of the glory of God in creation as we bring out the complete hiddenness of God for our eyes in Nature; of the image of God in man only as we give warning, once for all, that the man we know is fallen; of sin, only with the reminder that we should not know sin, were it not forgiven us; of the justification of the ungodly, only as we recall that it is the ungodly who is declared just.' There is a Yea in the Nay, there is also a Nay in the Yea, and each penetrates the other. The question is the answer, because the answer is the question.

In God's sight, Barth reiterates after Kierkegaard, we men are always in the wrong. Our culture and civilization, our morality, even our religion—all are wrong. This has a dazing effect, until we discover that by 'religion' Barth means what might perhaps better be called 'religiosity.' At all events, he would not deny that there may be religion of a right kind. Yet he uses the word polemically to denote man's seeking a way to God—religion as a human function, activity, accomplishment, which can be treated of psychologically or statistically. And this, he pronounces with vehemence, is simply another piece of 'the world,' imprisoned in the cosmic, never its conqueror. Mere religious consciousness will never lift men out of the realm of sin and death; it is the crown and

[1] 'The prophetic consciousness means, in fact, that human experience is real, and that the one sure key to the knowledge of God is our knowledge of man at his highest and best' (H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Experience of the Holy Spirit*, 29).

culmination of human experience, doubtless, but just for that reason the more questionable and unsatisfying. In this purely humane form it never has courage to face the terrifying fact of sin. Here is the tragedy of life, that man must be religious yet cannot be. All religion thus conceived can do is to force upon us a confession of the utter relativity of man before the absolute God. If theology is to recover health, it must cast loose from pre-occupation with this subjective phenomenon of piety and take its bearings anew from God, the Holy and Almighty. Only so can it return to the objectivity of the Bible and the Reformation. We have made a God after our own image, as Feuerbach told us eighty years ago; now we must again submit ourselves to the Divine righteousness and listen to the voice that speaks in conscience and from heaven.

Behind all this, again as with Kierkegaard, is a radically dualistic conception of the relation of God to man. There are two worlds or æons, one subject to 'the bondage of corruption,' one centred in the Living God. God is 'wholly other' than man the finite; the 'there' is strictly incommensurable with the 'here.' An infinite qualitative difference lies between God the Unconditioned, for whom our fittest category is the Impossible, and the old world of the contingent and the lost. No sort of continuity joins the new to the old, yet everything on this side reaches out its hands to the farther bank, drawn thither by an inscrutable transcendental relationship to the Absolute Being, that Point in another plane by which all else is equally produced and cancelled. The problematical nature of all existence is, as it were, a finger indicating the assured supramundane basis there must be; the questions we put to life are all of them questions put to us by Another. That utterly other world touches ours, the given world of sin, judgment, and death, only as tangent does circle, or, to employ another favourite symbol, as perpendicular descends upon base; and it comes as the extra-causal, extra-temporal transcendent factor which abolishes the given, that God may be all in all.

This primordial dualism is overcome in and by Christ. There is no way from man to God, not even through religion, as Barth defines it; all the more certainly is there a way from God to man. In Christ the new Reality dawns. He actualizes the impossible possibilities of which man in his religion had merely dreamed. But Barth is insistent that the Person he speaks of is not 'the Jesus of History.' Here is a point at which the paradoxical style in which the new theology is couched becomes gravely infelicitous; for by totally rejecting 'the historical Jesus,' Barth does not at all mean that Jesus Christ never existed. On the contrary, in His Cross eternity has invaded time; the utterly strange yet absolutely gracious God has thereby, by sheer miracle, broken into fallen temporality, declaring His sovereign righteousness, disclosing the identity of His wrathful holiness and His pardoning compassion. But this Jesus is not accessible to mere historical or psychological inquiry. Study of the Synoptic Gospels is making this clearer every day. The historical (*i.e.* real) Jesus must always be contemplated in the light of His supra-historical relationship to God—which means that we must get back to a serious use of the idea of 'revelation.' Neither Christ's death nor His resurrection can be read simply in terms of history; in both God is invisibly and sovereignly active, reflecting the transcendent 'beyond' into the world of time. The Resurrection is the turning of the ages; from this point of view Barth can say it means the same as the Parousia. Christ marks the swerving of life from Nay to Yea, from judgment to grace, from death to life. 'Jesus Christ is *not* the keystone in the arch of *our* thought. He is *not* a supernatural miracle, in which we might undertake to believe. He is *not* the goal we should find awaiting us at the end of our conversion stories. He is not a figure in our history, to whom we can gain a "relationship." Least of all is He the object of religious and mystical experiences. In so far as He is all this to us, He is not Jesus Christ. He is God, who becomes man, the Creator of all things, who lies in the cradle as a child. But these words must be interpreted by those others: He is the Crucified, Dead, Buried, Descended into hell, who is risen from the dead.' The limits of human possibilities have been broken through, and the Divine possibility has become fact.

No passage in Barth's writings gives a stronger impression of his force and penetration than this on the supernatural character of the salvation made ours in Christ. 'The highest expression of the *totaliter aliter* announced in the Bible is the preaching of the forgiveness of sins. Now that we are on the point, I feel as if this word "forgiveness" compels our astonishment more than the raising of Lazarus. It is an inconceivably new factor in our practical reckoning. This new-constituting of the moral subject, right in the midst of moral and political reality, by a man's insertion in the order of the Divine Kingdom, and his being reckoned as God's; this sight of the

beginning of good in the very midst of evil; this establishment of his royal freedom through the royal freedom of God; this possibility of viewing alike what is nearest and what is farthest in the light of God, and of doing greatest and least to God's glory—man in his captive, limited, and provisional life yet simultaneously stayed on God quite exclusively, disturbed by God, and by God borne up—is that something we can deduce psychologically, or prove, or visualize? Is it not something rather outside all history, a sheerly new thing, an absolute datum?'

To the *soli Deo gloria* there answers on the human side *sola fide*. Barth's first words—though not his last—on faith are deeply hostile to all psychological interpretation. It is the content that matters, not the emotional form. We must here ignore all inner processes, all subjective experience, and think rather of a transcendently Divine event that occurs in the believer. So far can Barth drive this, that he declares faith, from the psychological point of view, to be a sheer self-emptying. Faith is a vacuum, to which the Eternal gives itself as content. Without dwelling on obvious and reasonable objections to this (though it is a point at which Barth has essential mysticism, which he does not love, on his side), we may at least say that it is difficult to apprehend the notion of a faith which is the *unexperienced* attention to God's judgment and grace, and at the same time a bowing *with fear and trembling* under the condemnation and acceptance spoken in Christ. It is one thing to say that faith is spiritual and cannot be psychically localized; it is quite another to deny it all psychical character, as though 'grace' could not be sovereignly present in mental process. There are passages in Barth which go very near suggesting that when we believe savingly, it is not we who believe at all, but Christ in us.

The Church, in Barth's view of it, is as equivocal a fact as religion itself. The institution we know belongs, like all earthly things, to the present age, the æon of flesh and sin, and is no more than a more or less perfected organization which exists to advance certain great human interests. Hence, like the world, it stands in absolute antithesis to God; so far from being the Kingdom of God, it is the Tower of Babel. Not that the sect is worthier—on the contrary, 'Better with the Church in hell than with Pietists of higher or lower type in a heaven—which does not exist!' There is no evading the truth that the more 'efficient' and 'up to date' the Church becomes, the more it is the object of Divine judgment and rejection. If this means that in proportion as the Church comes to be complacent, galvanized, or self-deifying, it has lost touch with the purposes for which Christ gathered round Him a fellowship of faith and love; if it means that men as such, however much they 'get together,' cannot of themselves heal the hurt of even one soul, but that God alone can save and bless, we shall all agree, though we may ask whether, in asserting so solemn but also so patent a truth, there was need for wild and chaotic words. Even the actual Church, with all its faults, may be entitled to more credit and consideration than it receives at these hands. It was no shallow twentieth-century propagandist but John Calvin himself who spoke of it thus: 'Let us learn by the mere name of mother how profitable, indeed how necessary, is the knowledge of her; since there is no other entrance into life unless she herself conceive us in her womb, unless she bear us, unless she foster us at her breast, unless she guard us under her care and government, until we put off this mortal flesh, and become like the angels.' Barth cannot escape from this difficulty by pointing to the perfectly familiar distinction between the visible and the invisible Church. If the Church, as Barth himself proceeds to urge, is the *communio sanctorum*, the home of penitence, we may well ask whether this *communio* has not always taken social forms and does not, as a fact, confront us either in the actual Church as we know it, or nowhere at all. There is surely some middle path between putting the actual Church in place of God and denying it every kind of spiritual value. May we not all unite in saying that the Church, like the family, is God's potential instrument for the sovereign ends of grace?

No Barthian, I imagine, will ever admit that his views can be stated by an outsider without caricature, but it is to be hoped that in the foregoing account some approach to justice has been made. Barth is not simple; but he inquires pointedly whether life is simple, and whether it was to be anticipated that we men should succeed in affirming the final truths of God otherwise than in the language of explosive paradox. He rightly rejects the plea that Christian men would do better to keep to practical religious tasks and leave theology alone. If you have to *preach*, must you not clarify your thought of what you stand for, against Rome, against secularism, against all theology that centres in man or the Ego? And the best starting-point is that of universal doubt concerning all previous systems. 'He who wishes to be sure, must first have become absolutely unsure.'

In reading Barth we ought constantly to say to ourselves—*respice finem.* Take his first iconoclastic utterances with a pinch of salt; wait till he has concluded his argument before you pronounce a verdict. He may begin with shattering negatives, but it is ten to one he *knows* they are exaggerations and has indulged in them in order to rouse the complacent and shake them into real thinking. This dialectic procedure is not so far convincing as a natural mode of reaching the ultimate implications of the Christian gospel, and may only result in putting a differently constructed logic in place of the Hegelian; but it has an interest and austerity of its own. The theology of Barth, whatever else, is the theology of a great, a volcanic, soul, that has trembled at the Word of God. With a passionate and prophetic intensity, he is seeking to draw the Christian mind of his generation back to the vast truth that in the Bible, interpreted by the Spirit, God has spoken to the world, and spoken once for all. There is an objective revelation, which is as much above our jurisdiction as the stars in the sky. We must question all human formations, whether inward or outward; we must put them at the bar, under the judgment of the Lord of heaven and earth. This is, above all, true of theologies—and Barth, as he tells us explicitly, would not exempt his own. In theology we must think our very best—that is our duty. But we must never forget how the end of all theologies is that every mouth is stopped before God.

Barth is important and memorable, if not for his solutions, at least for the cardinal questions he compels us to encounter. And he does compel us. He thrusts upon us those terrible live problems that are rampant in the world. So far he seems to have spoken at least as much from the standpoint of the 'anxious inquirer' as from that of the full and characteristic Christian faith which animates Ro 8. Over much of his writing we might place the motto: 'It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God.' Only in the closing chapter, as it were, does he turn to expound that deeper word: 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father.' But this distribution of accent may yet change, and if it changes, Barth will prove an even greater and more revolutionary Christian force than at this hour.

Literature.

THE FAITH THAT REBELS.

It is not so long ago that the late Sir Henry Jones expounded his philosophical creed under the phrase, 'A Faith that Enquires.' The title of Principal D. S. Cairns's new book appears to have been modelled on that phrase. But it is a very different type of exposition that is here offered. *The Faith that Rebels* (S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net) is the faith of Jesus Himself. It is true, says Dr. Cairns, that Jesus lived and worked in the spirit of the prayer, 'Thy will be done,' but His attitude to the world's evil was not one of acquiescence but of opposition, and in this He was conscious of aligning Himself with the Divine will. And, further, by the exercise of a rebellious, as distinguished from an acquiescent, faith—as in His miracles—He claimed to have power given Him from on high to overcome pain, disease, and death.

It is, in the main, a re-examination of the miracles of Jesus that Dr. Cairns offers in this volume. The point he would emphasize is that these are represented in the Gospels as Divine answers to the prayers of a faith that rebelled against evil as being alien to the Kingdom of God; and it is suggested that inasmuch as Jesus wrought miracles by His human faith in God, and not in virtue of His possession of metaphysical Deity, the power of working miracles passed from Him to those who in the early days caught the secret of His faith, and there is no insuperable reason why such power should not be exercised in our modern world.

This way of approach to the miracles of Jesus is not the way of the older Christian apologetic. The miracles are not to be regarded as mere adjuncts to the Christian revelation, as being 'evidences' of its truth; they are affirmed to be integral parts of it. But while many would endorse Dr. Cairns's criticisms of the 'traditional' or evidential theory of miracle, and admit the force also of his criticisms of the 'modernist' view (which rejects miracle in the name of science and the 'closed system' of Nature), they would hesitate to accept the view of miracle here expounded and defended. Apart altogether from

a priori difficulties in regard to the conception of miracle, they would still be inclined to accentuate the distinction between healing miracles and 'Nature' miracles, and even in the case of the recorded miracles of healing, they would ask every time, Is the record trustworthy? Indeed we must say, in view of the critical discussions of the miracles of Jesus that have been maintained during the last hundred years or so, it is a defect of Dr. Cairns's work that it virtually assumes without discussion the genuine or authentic quality of the evangelistic records, apparently in their entirety.

While the main object of the book is to call attention to the 'steady reiteration' in the Synoptic narratives of the vital relation between the miracles and faith, there is much else in it of interest and value. For Dr. Cairns seeks to set his views on miracle in the context of modern thought. One of his best chapters is on 'Nature and Morality.' It is affirmed that Nature, so far from being indifferent to moral and spiritual ends, is plastic in the Divine hands for the discipline of the human spirit. Here, as elsewhere throughout the volume, and not least in the eloquent concluding chapter on the problem of evil, the style is frank, sincere, and expressive, and the author is seen to combine broadmindedness and a sympathetic tolerance with an evangelical and theistic conservatism.

A BASIS FOR THEOLOGY.

In *Philosophical Theology*, i. (Cambridge University Press; 21s.), a bulky volume of four hundred and twenty pages, the Rev. F. R. Tennant, D.D., B.Sc., aims at supplying the student of theology with the philosophical information and orientation necessary before embarking on the special province of theology proper.

The peculiar danger of writing on philosophy *ad hoc* is that philosophical science should be coloured by an apologetic bias. We naturally distrust anyone who writes on any science with an interest in his mind beyond the interest of the science itself. It can at once be said that the student can take the vast amount of information gathered here with absolute confidence in its trustworthiness, up-to-dateness, and relevancy. Even technical students of philosophy will find here focussed an amount of knowledge which they can only find otherwise with difficulty scattered through many volumes. The theological student can accept this philosophical propædeutic to his own study without the slightest fear of having palmed off on him a peculiar brand of philosophy to suit the specific theological palate.

The wealth of material collected in this volume and genetically displayed is amazing, and even a bare enumeration of the topics is impressive—Consciousness, the senses and the intellect, perception, etc., self and soul, personality, Valuation—Rationalism, Empiricism, Idealism—Probability, Nature and Limits of Scientific Knowledge, Religious Experience. Besides these there are eleven appendices where important topics are more fully discussed.

It will thus be seen that the volume is more philosophical than theological, and one may doubt the relevancy of the title, but we imagine that in the second volume which is to follow the justification for the title will be substantiated. Even here we have interesting and important theological discussions, for example, 'faith,' where 'faith' in the religious sense is co-ordinated with 'faith' in science; and important distinctions valid in psychology, like that between 'psychic immediacy' and 'psychological immediacy' (p. 46), are used as a criterion to evaluate the worth of such realms as mysticism and the idea of the numinous, so well-known since Otto called attention to it. Whether one agrees or not with Dr. Tennant in the large use he makes of this latter distinction, no one can doubt the fairness and the worth of his method and matter. It may be that there is a tendency to make perceptual knowledge the norm of all knowledge, but, be that as it may, we have here a weighty treatment of those philosophical disciplines which the theologian must know and must decide on before he can with confidence enter on his own domain. Students of theology—even those whose university training has made them cognizant of the sciences of psychology, logic, metaphysics, and ethics, as well as those who have not had this training—will heartily thank Dr. Tennant for the help and information they are given in this book. We imagine also that those whose duty it is to teach theology will be foremost in praising him for a book which they can heartily recommend to their students.

CHRIST AND SOCIETY.

The Trustees of the Halley Stewart Lectureship have been fortunate in their choice of the first two lecturers on the trust. The first was Sir Oliver Lodge, whose 'Science and Human Progress' was a fascinating volume. It has been followed by a volume from Dr. Gore—*Christ and Society*

(Allen & Unwin ; 4s. 6d. net). Dr. Gore has been known not only for his High Church views and his able essays in apologetic, but also for his advanced opinions on the relation of Christianity to social politics. We have had more than one essay on this subject from his fertile pen, and the present volume may be regarded as a summary statement of views which he has long held and promulgated.

These views may be briefly indicated in a series of four propositions. First, the present condition of society, though not entirely discouraging, is yet such as to inspire a deep sense of dissatisfaction and alarm and a demand for thorough reformation. Second, the evils we deplore are due to human selfishness and avarice, and therefore their reformation demands more than anything else a change of spirit. Third, we must look for this altered attitude to life not to the conversion of masses but to groups of men inspired by prophetic leadership and ready for suffering and sacrifice in this cause. And, finally, Jesus Christ is the Saviour of men, not only individually but socially and in this present life, and those who believe in Him should band themselves together to further the principles which He taught.

In order to commend these statements Dr. Gore begins with the social teaching of Jesus, because one cause of our present weakness in the face of social evils is our uncertainty as to what Jesus taught about the subject. From this Dr. Gore proceeds to outline the historical attempts which have been made to embody Christ's idea of the Kingdom of God in the Apostolic Church, in the mediæval period, and under the influence of the Renaissance and the Reformation with their issue in the Industrial Revolution. Finally, the lectures return upon the main propositions, and, on the basis of his exposition of the gospel teaching and his historical review, Dr. Gore gathers up the lessons to be learned for our own day. Our task is to gird ourselves to the duty of letting the world know what the Church of Christ really stands for, what its real mind is about the foundations of society, about the relation of man to man and class to class and nation to nation.

Dr. Gore is not content with generalities. His cure for the distresses of the present is definite. We need to let the world see clearly, first of all, that Christianity is a life, and a life of fellowship with the community, not the individual first. One of our pressing necessities is a radical work on Christian ethics in order to enlighten men as to the real responsibilities of communal life. Further, we must form associations for Christian social propaganda, a series of Copecs which will be interdenominational. The purpose of those associations would be to reassert the social meaning of Christianity, and to proclaim the necessity of social and political changes which would leave the way to a full life free to all.

Such in brief is a summary of this suggestive volume. It has all Dr. Gore's clarity of thought, his persuasiveness, and his fairness. There are not a few points at which any of us might like to cross swords with the writer. But these are matters of detail for the most part. And on a general view of the lectures we can only say that on the whole the survey seems to us to be sound. Dr. Gore's fundamental propositions are beyond dispute, and it is to be hoped that in the wide audience that is sure to listen to him their earnest advocacy will bear the kind of fruit that he himself desires to see.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

Science and the Religious Life (Milford ; 13s. 6d. net), issued by the Yale University Press under the name of Mr. Carl Rahn, is an able and remarkably suggestive essay, showing wide culture and broad sympathies as well as freshness of outlook. But it is not always easy to catch its meaning and drift, and it presupposes a certain acquaintance with the technical terms of psychological and physiological analysis.

Obviously the author is deeply interested in the phenomena of religion, and in this essay he approaches religion from the psycho-physiological standpoint, viewing it as a matter of human experience and behaviour. Though he eschews metaphysical considerations, he finds room—significantly enough—from the scientific standpoint of organic evolution for the knowledge 'of which Plato speaks, that was sought by Plotinus and the neo-Platonists and by the Christian saints in the centuries after them.'

It is the starting-point of the book that on the hypothesis of organic evolution, used not merely as an explanatory principle but as a principle of quest, we may look for a changed or transfigured humanity. And it is the main contention of the book that, if we are to apprehend the nature of such a possible change, we should enter upon a psycho-physiological study of the fundamental attitudes of science and of the religious life. 'For it is at these points that human experience and behaviour bear the marks of organic adjustment.' Accordingly, the task which the author sets before

him is the aforesaid psycho-physiological study. He would analyse 'the psychological patterns of the scientific and the religious attitudes,' as also 'the physiological processes involved in the technique of the scientific and the religious life.'

Readers of this magazine would turn more readily to the second part of the work, where the religious life is considered in its physiological significance, in its emotional, attentional, and cognitive aspects, and from the standpoint of the psychology of volition and control. A point which the author makes apropos of the last-named standpoint is that the records of the religious experience often present to us elaborations of a technique of control indicating a surprising insight into the nature of the psycho-physiological processes. But of this we take note in another column.

NEO-HEGELIANISM.

A somewhat massive volume comes to hand entitled *Neo-Hegelianism*, by Professor Hiralal Haldar, Ph.D. (Heath Cranton; 25s. net). It is described as 'A Study rather than a History of British Neo-Hegelianism.' Writing on Neo-Hegelianism in Hastings' 'Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics,' Professor J. W. Scott remarked, 'Until some adequate history of the movement appears, the only way to get a grasp of what it had to teach is to read a few works of typical representatives of it.' This suggestion fell like a seed into the fertile soil of Professor Haldar's mind, and the present book is the result. The writer, it may not be unnecessary to explain, is Professor of Philosophy in the University of Calcutta, and he acknowledges that 'the study and interpretation of Hegel and the philosophical movement which has arisen from his influence has been the chief occupation of my life.' 'The only way,' he declares, 'to compel this dark philosopher to surrender his meaning is laboriously and patiently to keep pace with him, with bad falls occasionally, no doubt, as he explains the movement of the categories from Pure Being to the Absolute Idea. You must *think* with him, watch his thought, so to speak, in the making. One must understand the whole of Hegel or nothing of him — a hard task undoubtedly, but there is no way to avoid it. There is no royal road to the citadel of the Absolute Idea.' Professor Haldar has shirked no toil, and of his competence to speak as an authoritative interpreter of Hegel there can be no doubt. In the present volume he covers an immense amount of ground. Beginning, of course, with Hutchison Stirling and his epoch-making 'Secret of Hegel,' he goes on to expound the teaching of T. H. Green and the Cairds, to which he gives about a third of his book. Then follow chapters on W. Wallace, D. G. Ritchie, Bradley, Bosanquet, John Watson, Sir Henry Jones, Professors Muirhead and Mackenzie, Lord Haldane, and Dr. J. E. M'Taggart. All these are familiar names in the history of nineteenth-century British philosophy, and their views individually have been frequently expounded and criticised. But their association together in one volume and the sustained criticism of their views by one powerful thinker give a valuable conspectus of the philosophic system to which they all, more or less, owned allegiance. Professor Haldar is to be congratulated on a really fine piece of work. As his career as a teacher of philosophy draws to a close he has laid a noble tribute at the feet of his masters in the realm of thought.

John Bunyan, by the Rev. W. Charter Piggott (Congregational Union of England and Wales; 1s.), is a short but very readable account of the life and writings of the great Puritan dreamer. It is well that interest in Bunyan should by every means be stimulated in this the tercentenary year of his birth, and Mr. Piggott has contributed an account of him in a handy form such as will suit many readers.

Back to Realities, by Sydney Herbert Mellone, M.A., D.Sc. (Constable; 2s. net), is an attempt to find 'a way out of the present chaos in religion.' After briefly sketching the confusions which have arisen in connexion with the sacramentarian controversy and the discussions about evolution, Dr. Mellone goes on to suggest that there are only two logical positions possible, namely, Romanism, the religion of authority, and Unitarianism, the religion of reason. The various forms of Protestantism he dismisses rather summarily, but ends with the suggestion that we are all Unitarians without knowing it.

The Rev. J. Scott Lidgett, M.A., D.D., holds a unique place among the Wesleyans as a pioneer in every form of religious and social service. His *Reminiscences* (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net) are altogether too meagre to give any adequate conception of his life-work, but such as they are they will be prized. Apart from the personal record

they have an independent historical value as throwing light on the stormy period connected with the English education controversy and the work of the London County Council with which Dr. Scott Lidgett was so prominently associated.

The controversy between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism is always with us. It has been brought sharply to our minds in the recent Prayer Book discussions; and it is well that we should have before us in convenient form the late Dr. R. W. Dale's well-known Exeter Hall Lecture (1874) on *Protestantism.* The lecture has been republished at 1s. by the Independent Press. It finds the ultimate principle of Protestantism to be the direct access of the soul to God, the direct access of God to the soul. This principle assumes one form 'in our vindication of the Right of Private Judgment, another in our contention for the authority of Holy Scripture, and another in the doctrine of Justification by Faith.' We have had pleasure in reading again the pages of so eloquent and fair-minded a controversialist.

It is always interesting and profitable to listen to the reflections on life and doctrine of one who 'has seen many days' and yet remains optimistic and fresh of mind. And therefore we welcome *Ways towards the Spiritual Life,* by Professor G. Dawes Hicks (Lindsey Press; 5s. 6d. net). The title suggests a devotional manual, but the book in reality is quite different. Dr. Hicks has for a quarter of a century presided at the closing gathering of each session in the Presbyterian College, Carmarthen, and delivered an address to the outgoing students. This volume contains a selection of these. There is in these addresses a ripe wisdom, a level common sense, and a broad outlook which make it a pleasure to read them as it must have been to listen to them. Among the subjects are The Vocation of the Scholar, The Church and Human Life, The Religion of the New Democracy, Modernism in Theology, The Uprising of Youth, and Sincerity in Religion. Those who know where Dr. Hicks stands will know also what to expect in the way of theological standpoint. But whatever standpoint we hold we shall receive stimulus and inspiration from these admirable addresses.

A curious book has been compiled by the Rev. C. L. Drawbridge, M.A., which he calls *Futile Sermons* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net). The Archbishop of Canterbury made a statement at the Church Congress in 1925 about the preaching in the Church of England. It was an unfavourable statement, dwelling on the poverty of the average sermon, and its reasons and possible cures. The subject was taken up by all the newspapers in the kingdom, and Mr. Drawbridge gathers into a series of chapters the comments of different papers on the subject. The chapter headings follow the line of the Primate's remarks, and are something like this: Is the Average Sermon Bad? Are Bad Sermons the Chief Cause of Empty Churches? Midnight Oil, What are Adequate Sermons? Repeating Platitudes instead of Facing Problems, The Poverty of the Clergy, The Congregation to Blame. And so on. Interspersed are comments by the author. Such a book may possibly do preachers in training or preachers in practice some good if only by the promotion in them of a humble spirit. For others it will be dull reading perhaps. Yet you never know.

A little book of a useful kind that has stood the test of trial is *How to Make Your Meditation,* by the Rev. H. Congreve Horne (Longmans; 1s. 6d. net). We all think and we think most of the time. The problem here dealt with is how to make our thinking effective for life. Simple directions are given both for Bible-reading and for prayer, and a method is suggested by which we may conduct a 'meditation' in a practical and fruitful fashion. The little book is written quite simply and in a beautiful spirit and is bound to be helpful.

John Bunyan, The Man and His Work, by the Venerable A. R. Buckland, M.A. (R.T.S.; 2s. 6d. net), is 'not offered as a new life of Bunyan, nor as a critical study of his publications. It is rather a book about the man and his work addressed to the general reader, with the simple aim of meeting the needs of those who wish to know something of Bunyan, his times, his career, his published works, their character and their influence.' Though thus modestly introduced, it is a piece of solid workmanship, and may be warmly commended. The writer has acquainted himself with the chief authorities and writes with lucidity and an easy mastery of the facts.

The Rev. Francis Bartlett Proctor, M.A., F.K.C.L., who describes himself as 'an octogenarian preacher,' has collected together twenty-three discourses in a volume curiously entitled, *Orthodox Prophesying Deceits* (Elliot Stock; 6s. net). Apparently he is of opinion that our popular preaching is at once orthodox and merely rhetorical, and that it

may be described as 'telling lies about God,' presumably in ignorance. He regards himself as 'advanced,' as believing that the Creeds need revision in the light of modern knowledge; but in some respects he is far from being so, as witness the following remark concerning John the beloved disciple: 'We make the bold and adventurous suggestion that, as there is no authentic record of his death, it is possible he did not die at all.' The style of the volume tends to be as disjointed as its title.

Close Quarters, by Mr. R. D. Rees, M.A. (S.C.M.; 2s. net), is a live book. The writer is a missionary in China who, when at home on furlough, has taken part in various conferences and campaigns at which he has endeavoured to envisage the world situation as a whole, and to base upon it a call to Christian service. The substance of these addresses makes a book well worth reading, full of sanity and strong Christian thinking, combined with that wide outlook and freedom from national and racial prejudice which we associate with the best of our missionaries.

Your Bible, by the Rev. J. Arnold Quail, M.A., B.D. (Teachers & Taught; 1s. 6d. net), is a remarkable little book. Its design is to give an account of the ancestry and origin of the English Bible in terms suitable to the capacity of youthful readers. The writer has achieved a real success. Step by step he leads backward through versions and manuscripts to the original books and to the life behind the books. It is a fascinating sketch of the agelong drama of revelation.

The Grounds of the Belief in the Resurrection of Jesus, by the Rev. R. Macgregor (Wardman, Letchworth; 6d.), is a brief tract dealing with the various theories which have been put forward, and arguing that the disciples saw the Risen Christ 'in the sense that they had Divine authority for the conviction that He was risen.' It is thoughtful, but all too slight for so great a theme.

The Sermon on the Mount.

Prayer (Mt. vii. 7-12).

By the Reverend Canon A. W. F. Blunt, M.A., B.D., Derby.

I.

In the realm of prayer our Lord walks as assured Master of its roads, its laws, and its life. Other men have 'been there,' some of them 'far ben' in it, and speak of what they have learnt on their visits. He lived there. The prayer-country was His native air. The occasions on which He is recorded to have prayed are only points that men marked in a line which was always continuous. We are told of times when He prayed with vehemence, or continued long in prayer. We treasure words of prayer which He used on this or on that occasion. But our knowledge of the nature of His prayer-activity rests on evidence that goes deeper than these instances; it rests on the deep foundation of our belief as to who He was. 'The Son of Man, which is in heaven,' so the Fourth Gospel defines Him (Jn 3^{13}). In heaven, even when on earth; His living reveals the heavenly life as it may be lived under earthly conditions. He never left heaven, for His mind always moved 'in the heavenly places.' Of Him it was fact which of us is too often but aspiration or ideal, that 'our citizenship is in heaven.' And the very life-breath of the heavenly life is that intercourse with God which men call 'prayer.'

Our Lord, then, prayed because He could not do otherwise. Human as He willed to become, He doubtless needed prayer, as we all need it, to fortify Him against His daily 'temptations' and to give Him grace for His daily service. But these necessities only set the form in which at times His prayers shaped themselves. Apart from these temptations and these needs, He prayed for the ultimate reason which justifies all prayer—because prayer is the natural exercise of the human spirit. It is, in the truest truth of things, as natural for man's soul to desire to pray as it is natural for man's lungs to desire to breathe. We pray by a native prompting, and only secondarily, because man is frail and the world is evil, by an induced

habit. For we must realize that it is native to man to desire health. This is seen to hold good beyond question in the physical or the mental sphere. The body craves for healthy air and exercise and food; sickness is the protest that nature makes if the body is denied her proper regimen. The mind is built to desire knowledge; ignorance or stupidity or superstition is nature's protest against the starvation or the malnutrition of the intellectual faculties. By parity of reasoning, sin may be regarded as nature's protest against the denial to the soul of that diet of grace which it needs in order to grow healthily. Man's soul, unperverted, craves for that which is good. Its natural food is the good gifts which, however mediated to us, come from God. Prayer is the conscious effort to resort to God for His good things—the things which man, the child of God, spontaneously craves for and alone finds really satisfying.

In a sense, of course, God's love and grace are all around and about us, whether we recognize it or not. 'In him we live, and move, and have our being.' God encompasses us. His love is the air of the spiritual world. But we may, if we choose, refuse to breathe it in. In that world evil influences are also at work, and to them we may, if we will, have recourse, so perverting our true nature and seeking to delight ourselves in that which will not feed or enrich our souls, though for the time we think it sweet. The deliberate exercise of prayer is needed if we are to learn to recognize and appreciate and take delight in that which God offers. In every sphere of life man has to be taught to know and seek that which alone is good for him; and in each sphere man is often woefully stubborn to go his own self-willed way and to spend money for that which is not bread, and labour for that which satisfieth not.

II.

We do not, then, reach to the inmost truth about the necessity of prayer, when we think of it only as a shield against the fiery darts of the wicked, or only as a weapon for the casting down of strongholds. Of course it is those, but it is those only incidentally to the fact that, in a world where evil is strong, man has enemies who seek to prevent him from attaining the full human stature. In its inmost essence prayer is the search for the necessary diet of the human soul. Man is built to achieve spiritual greatness, and prayer is a necessity for spiritual achievement.

It is, then, the highest employment of man's self-determining activity. 'Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto you' (7^7). We may please ourselves by detecting a delicate discrimination between these three forms of conative activity. We seek for that which we have not, and do not yet know where to find. We knock at the door of a house which we believe ourselves desirous to enter, but have not yet entered. We ask for that which we have not, but know where to find. But this discrimination is perhaps more subtle than we need to make it. For all three—asking, seeking, and knocking—are in different similes but expressions of one human activity, the activity of desire. The law which our Lord here declares may be first, most generally, and most simply formulated thus: 'Sow a desire and reap an achievement.'

The universe is so framed as to be responsive to human desire. Therein, as is well known, is one great argument for the belief in immortality; the desires of the human heart are prophecies of their fruition. Man, as a free creative being, is entrusted with a power to wring from the universe by the force of his desiring that on which he sets his affection. It is perhaps the supreme testimony of the trust that God reposes in man that He has made us such as can bend events to our will. Our responsibility for the character of our desires is, then, a very serious one. For even wrong desires and low ambitions have their effective power. Our Lord indicated this possibility clearly enough. They who make their prayers or do their alms to be seen of men have, He said, 'their reward.' The law of the power of human desire is not annulled when the reward desired is not worth having or not finally satisfactory. To some men, we hear, God 'gave their desire and sent leanness withal into their souls.' They desired, and therefore achieved. The achievement left them lean; but the desire did not fail to achieve its end. 'We are such stuff as dreams are made of' is true in another sense than Shakespeare intended. For it is the yearnings of our souls, good or evil, high or low, that make us what we are. A noble desire makes a noble man, and a mean desire makes a mean man.

Hence, if to sow a desire is to reap an achievement, nothing can be more important than to sow the right sort of desires. No aspiration can be more fundamentally right than to have 'an understanding heart,' understanding to know what is good, and the heart engaged to love it. 'That we may love the thing which thou commandest, and desire that which thou dost promise,' what else is that but the gift of Faith? 'Faith is the

substance of things hoped for,' it is that which convinces us of the 'is-ness' of ideals. To think on the things which are pure and noble and of good report, to think on and desire them, that, it may be said, is a matter of spiritual 'taste,' and tastes proverbially differ. But here interposes the truth which is the deepest truth about man, that he is made in the image of God; that therefore to love the highest and desire the noblest is man's native bent. Man's soul craves for health, and in God alone finds it. 'My soul is athirst for God.' This is not true only of an occasional individual's temperament. It is the *vérité vraie* about the nature of man. 'In God's will alone is our peace.' 'Thou, O Lord, hast made us for thyself, and our heart knows no rest until it rests in thee.' Man is made such that he can find no final satisfaction save in God. We may, we do, debase our high estate, deface God's image in us, seek satisfaction in vanity. But that chase is feverish and pathological. In each of us is a Divine something which witnesses whose children we really are; and that element we can atrophy, we can frightfully distort, but it is very hard to kill it entirely. It keeps on reviving, for it is part of our veriest nature. *Naturam expellas furca, tamen usque recurret* ('Expel nature with a pitchfork, and she will yet return'). That line, no doubt, was written with a cynical suggestion; but we who have learnt in Jesus Christ what man really is, we to whom the Incarnation has taught that, to use Bishop Gore's striking phrase, 'so truly was man made in God's image that God could really live a human life without ceasing to be God,' we know what is the ineradicable element in human nature. Many men have gone far in the eradicating of the evil in them; but has any man ever yet quite succeeded in eradicating the good in himself?

III.

We have no need to search for a statement of what man's highest desires can be. The Lord's Prayer (6^{9-13}) provides us with the perfect summary of these. Let us note, firstly, the order in which desires are to be graded. First we are to wish God's wishes. 'Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done.' And, if God is indeed 'our Father,' what else is it possible, is it even rational, to put first except what He wishes? Of course nothing in the universe can be better for man than His will. 'Thy will be done.' We say it in a minor key in the time of our tribulation. Well if we can do that at least without whining an acquiescence which is but the expression of a peevish resentment; better if we can rise even then to a major key of joyful acceptance. But if that is a heroism of faith beyond our compass, at any rate let us teach ourselves in the days of our wealth to believe that nothing better for man can happen than that God's will should be done. For God's will is the only hope of man's happiness.

After, but only after, we have learnt to wish God's wishes may we safely be allowed to wish for ourselves; for then we shall only wish for ourselves those things which we need in order to serve Him. Forgiveness and guidance—the fundamental necessities for health of spirit; and provision—the elementary necessity for the health of the spirit's material organ: these are the sum total of what we have need of. And even these we are to desire for the common behoof; even in praying for myself I am not to isolate my own need from the common good which includes mine. 'Give us, forgive us, deliver us.' The Lord's Prayer is the prayer of the family circle. The Father sets the direction of the family activity. Each of His children, utterly dependent as he is on the Father's grace and care, is called to offer his co-operative effort to the realization of the Father's will for the enrichment of the whole family life. Herein, then, is comprehended all that a Christian need desire. All Christian prayers that have ever been uttered can only be commentaries on, or inferences from, or elaborations of, one or other of these pregnant clauses.

As the Lord's Prayer is the summary of Christian desire, so it is the model for the Christian expression of desire. We should realize this more firmly than we do. We say the prayer too glibly; perhaps we say it too often. The very brevity of the phrases should be to us an advice of their real character. They are surely the final acts of a spiritual struggle of meditation on the Will of God and on our duty in regard to it. A whole lifetime of growth in the understanding and love of God's will is not too long to teach us how to say the Lord's Prayer really well. The utterances are the outburst from a soul that has made a sustained effort to consecrate its desires to God. Indeed, on one very sacred occasion, in our Lord's Agony in Gethsemane, we are allowed to see in part the spiritual process actually at work in Him. 'If it be possible, let this cup pass away from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.' 'If this cannot pass away, except I drink it, thy will be done.' There is, may we not say, a clear progress of self-dedication here? In that mysterious struggle of will against feeling

He moves from 'I would' through 'Thou willest not' to 'Thy will be done,' and 'I come to do thy will, O God.'

If, then, prayer is such a process as this, what need can there be for 'much speaking' or 'vain repetitions' (6[7])? The real battle of the spirit takes place in the silence. The words only register the victory. When the word comes, the struggle is over.

If we talk too much in our prayers—and do we not?—may it not be because we talk too easily? There is, it may be, a fatal fluency in praying, as in preaching. If we gave ourselves more vehemently to the struggle to reach and make our own God's point of view, our words of prayer would assuredly be fewer; but their power would be more convincing. Our praying is too often only from the teeth outwards; it is not the explosion of a spirit which has agonized to know what God means, to accept what God wills, and to love what God commands. We mean well, but we do not mean hard enough, nor from a deep enough depth within us. Our souls do not sweat in their praying, as our Lord's did in His. And so our spiritual progress lags. *Tantum proficies quantum tibi vim adhibueris* ('Thy profiting shall be according to the measure of the violence thou dost to thyself'). Is this perhaps what our Lord meant when He spoke of the violent men who take the Kingdom of Heaven by force?

IV.

We recur to our first formulation of our Lord's law of prayer: 'Sow a desire and reap an achievement.' The phrase has an Emersonian sound. It is none the worse for that. Emersonianism is no bad starting-point from which to set out on the path of reflection about Christian truth. But we have travelled a long way since then; and, as we now revise that formula, does it not seem to us to have a tang of a certain self-sufficiency, which is perhaps also Emersonian, which is certainly not purely Christian? An 'achievement,' we said; but 'what hast thou that thou didst not receive? But if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it?' Moreover, achievement perhaps implies the manipulation of circumstances; at least it seems to speak of a battle against resistance. Well, even that last is not an unauthorized picture of the process of prayer, if we call to mind Jacob's wrestling with the angel or our Lord's exhortations to importunity. God, it may be, loves to test the metal of our desire.

Yet, if He does so, it is only in love. The Christian revelation speaks its most glorious truth when it bids us see the universe as the sphere for the operation of a love which is through and through personal. When we realize this, 'achievement' seems a poor, cold, impersonal word for a relation in which our Father and we are jointly engaged. 'Ask, and ye shall receive.' No, 'Sow a desire and reap an achievement' does not do justice to the magnificent anthropomorphism of that sentence. Shall we, then, rephrase our formula? 'Sow a desire and reap a grace'—that is better. If there is one certainty that our Lord seems to affirm most confidently in this passage, it is that the Divine Father responds to the desire of His children. Yet even this way of putting the relation does not touch the deepest of its gracious mystery. What does our Lord mean when He reminds us that 'your Father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask him,' if not that God's grace is not simply responsive to man's desire, but is previous to it? 'Before ye ask him,' our Father's love is welling out from Him to usward. It is the eternal *prius* of anything that we can desire, let alone express. He knows our necessities before we ask. He wills our good before we ourselves desire it.

Theological students will recognize herein the truth for the due acknowledgment of which Augustine battled so fiercely, so remorselessly, against Pelagius. We may well be grateful that he did so. For indeed that conviction of the eternal priority of God's movement to any motion of man is ultimately the only reason why we dare to pray at all. We dare, ignorant as we are and know ourselves to be, to interpose our desires into the course of this world of God's, because we are sure that His loving wisdom holds on its course, unclouded in its vision and unshaken in its purpose by any errors that we may commit in directing our desires to this or that object; and that, though our wishing may be as foolish as it is eager, yet, if only our heart be right with Him, He can see beneath our foolishness to our sincerity and can use the force of that for His ends of good. More, we are sure that His love is at work before we ask. Our Father, who knows what things we have need of before we ask, does not require to be stimulated to desire our satisfaction. 'Before they call, I will answer.' God's love is active before it is invoked. Our wills are ours; but before we knew that we had a will, He had been working on us to persuade us to make our wills His; and the highest we can achieve is to give in to His persuasion. If we at all desire what is good, it is because He has moved us to it. So far as there is 'response' in

the relation between Him and us, it is from us that it must first come. For His love ever and always moves first.

We commonly speak of prayer and grace as a relation of reciprocity; and there is certainly a truth in such a presentation, for our Lord Himself uses it. 'Seek, and ye shall find; ask, and ye shall receive.' It is the gracious aspect of the universal law of retribution. 'With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you again' is a word that contains an obvious threat or warning; but it also has its promise. 'Desire of me, and I will give thee'; in aspiration and its satisfaction too, as well as in sin and judgment, action and reaction play their parts. This is why St. Matthew places the golden rule which is for human relations side by side with the teaching on the Father's readiness to answer prayer (7^{12}). All that we do to men, we do to God; and God sees to the requiting of it. The same idea is contained in our Lord's assertion of the reciprocity of forgiveness. 'If ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you' ($6^{12. 14. 15}$). Right in the centre of all our human relationships our Father holds His place, and works His work. If we forgive our brother, our brother's response may come or may tarry, but the requital of our Father's forgiveness is immediate and certain. For our act of forgiveness is the effective act of our desire for goodwill among men, and that desire God meets with His goodwill towards us.

We reach, nevertheless, a deeper truth about God's dealings with us when we pass beyond the conception of reciprocity and learn to think of prayer and grace as a relation of co-operation between God and man. The desire that is finally effectual is that which God and man desire together; in St. James' phrase, 'the fervent prayer of a righteous man,' of a man, that is to say, whose will is given to God; in short, the prayer which God's Spirit utters within us. As forgiveness of neighbour is essentially a plea for human co-operation to restore a broken harmony, so prayer is essentially a co-operation with God to set forward His kingdom; and such co-operation cannot be ineffectual, for there is God Almighty in it.

What, then, of the puzzle of what men call 'unanswered prayer'? One may protest in passing that there is no such thing; 'ungranted' prayer there may be, but no true prayer fails of a true answer. But we may let the phrase stand under protest, and proceed to examine the puzzle.

Some of the alleged difficult cases are not hard to face for any one who possesses the true Christian conviction of his own ignorance and the true Christian belief in God's wisdom. Our desire was not granted, because God knew better. But yet, if our will was rightly set to desire God's Will, our prayer was not wasted. God could see through the mistake of our application to the fundamental desire that we entertained for the doing of God's Will in God's way, and could use the force of our willing even while waving aside the application that we thought to give it.

God, therefore, granted the will of our heart, though not the desire of our lips; and granted it, let us be sure, in part because we willed it. None of the spiritual masters of Christendom, from our Lord downwards, has had any doubt that prayer works effects, that it is a creative contribution to God's result. It matters little how we justify this conviction. We may, as some do, put it thus, that as Christ could do no mighty work where He was met with unbelief, so God needs the right conditions to make His Will effectual, and that our prayer generates the sympathetic atmosphere in which God's desire may have free course.

Or we may take our stand on the fact of man's freedom to help or to hinder God. As by service, so by desire, I, because I am free, can contribute to the doing of God's Will. My will, which He gave me to use for or against Him, I take and empty into the stream of God's willing; and so I actually add to the force of its current, as by disloyalty I can obstruct it. Our desires, then, so far forth as we project them on God's side, are a body of power which He can use for His purposes. Each one of us who says and means 'Thy will be done' helps Him to make that Will effective.

But some of the hard cases are not so easy to face. For in them it seems as if it were certain that the desire was one which God must share. A mother prays that her son may 'run well.' She wants it because she loves him and loves God; and God, we are humbly sure, wants it too; and yet the effect does not follow. The answer to this difficulty lies hid in the mystery of iniquity. There is 'one that letteth.' So long as we see 'not yet' all things put under Christ's feet, so long, however we phrase it, have we to admit that in this or in that case the devil is yet too strong for God and man together. 'The devil is gone down to earth, having great wrath.'

Yet of one fact the Christian will be sure, that God's desire is such as Christ revealed it, a will of perfect love to all and to each. It is because she so believes that the Christian mother will carry her prayers even into the region of despair, that

she will pursue her son with her agonizing love even into the realm beyond this earth, and will be sure that God's love is pursuing him too, even into the city of dreadful night. She will feel that she is God's partner in desire and in the agony of desire frustrated; and so she will carry her cross and fill up that which is lacking in the sufferings of Christ, and still believe in God's love, though with a broken heart. When once Christian love gets to its knees in intercession for a loved one, it may have to suffer agonies as it beseeches; but it will not rise without the assurance, 'And thou too dost love the one I love.'

V.

Our brief study of this section of the Sermon on the Mount must draw to a close. Let us sum up the main truths that it has taught us. They are but two, and they are very simple. Firstly: Prayer is natural. Man, God's child, natively desires that which is good. Prayer is the act by which the human soul seeks the air and food that minister true health to it. And secondly: Prayer works. Because God is our Father and has given freedom to us, His children, therefore, where God and man unite in desire, things happen. Prayer is the act in which we link our hands into God's to further His aims; therein the Divine desire and the human desire become fellow-workers; and from this partnership results follow. Of course, for 'a short time' the devil has power to frustrate that which God purposes. But 'I believe in God Almighty.' Because God is God, the final victory of His goodwill is sure. And for each of us the love and the service of that Will are the highest achievements to which we can aspire. To attain it is to reach the full growth of the human stature.

Two Remarkable Glosses in the Text of Hebrews.

By J. Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D., D.D., Birmingham.

The history of the text of the New Testament is, to an extent which has not been adequately realized, the history of its glosses, that is, of those expansions which are commonly regarded as improper accretions to the original narrative. If we could trace such accretions to their proper authors, or assign them to their approximate dates, we should certainly have done much to lift the study of textual criticism out of its present confusion as a mêlée of alphabets, numbers and signs and symbols. It must, however, be understood at the outset that no real progress can certainly be made so long as we speak of glosses in a sense which implies *petitio principii*. The supposed glosses may, in many cases, turn out to be part of the primitive text; there may have been reasons for removal, as well as grounds for insertion. In any case, we must not use the word 'gloss' as a 'question-begging epithet.' The study of such augmented passages, as in the Acts of the Apostles, for example, lies at the very heart of New Testament criticism.

I have recently been examining with some care a couple of these so-called glosses in the eleventh chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, neither of which has the least prospect, in our present state of textual knowledge, of being given a position of dignity in the text, or a secure foothold in the apparatus to the text; they seem, however, to be deserving of some closer attention, in spite of the fact that Dr. Moffatt speaks of them contemptuously as being 'thrown up by the Latin version'; as if the Latin tradition was like the troubled sea of the Old Testament whose waters cast up mire and dirt! If the Latin tradition behaves in that way, and there is Greek attestation as well as Latin for the glosses referred to, we shall have Dr. Moffatt enlisted on the side of those who say that certain Greek MSS have latinized: for how else does the mud attach to them? But to come to our particular study.

The two glosses to which we refer are both of them in the roll-call of the deeds and the heroes of faith, which has for its formula the introductory words, 'By faith.' Two new instances are introduced, one of them referring to Moses, the other to the Israelites at the time of the Exodus. *By faith Moses*, and *By faith Israel*; so we may call them the 'By Faith' glosses, bearing in mind what we have said about avoiding preliminary prejudications.

Our first gloss adds to the text of v.[23] the following words :

> ' By faith Moses, when he was grown up (μέγας γενόμενος) destroyed the Egyptian, observing (κατανοῶν) the humiliation of his brethren ' ;

the second gloss is at the end of v.[28], and records that

> ' By faith they plundered the Egyptians when they went out.'

As regards the attestation of these two passages, it will be sufficient at this point to say that the former reading has both Greek and Latin support (the Greek evidence being that of the Codex Claromontanus, Cod. D, together with its transcript Cod. E, and another), and the latter reading has, as far as we know, only Latin support. There is no need to distract our minds by trying to decipher von Soden's hieroglyphics. Let us come to the subject-matter of the two new statements.

Each of them is concerned with the vindication of a doubtful passage in Old Testament morals : the first with the question whether Moses was a murderer who broke his own law ; the second with the question whether the Israelites were robbers at the Exodus, who ran off with the jewellery of the Egyptian ladies. The similarity in the ethical problems involved invites the suggestion that the two ' By Faith ' glosses are from the same hand. Perhaps they are due to an attempt at justification by faith in a non-Pauline sense. Each of them is related to objections made in very early times : the first has caused a reaction on the text of the New Testament itself ; the second is meant to refute an objection made by the Marcionites, but which may very well be earlier than Marcion. Either of them, then, is early. Let us begin with Moses.

It is well known that the dispute between Michael and the devil over the body of Moses in the Epistle of Jude relates to this very question. The devil claims the body on the ground that Moses is a murderer. Satan was not afraid to speak evil of dignities, as St. Jude would say. Michael makes a stately, an almost contemptuous reply ; the glossator in Hebrews has one which is more to the point. *Moses acted in faith.*

This was not the only case in which apology for Moses was necessary. His marriage with the Ethiopian girl was an early problem, which the Church solved (1) by the general rule laid down in the *Teaching of the Apostles*, that one is not to judge the actions of the prophets by ordinary standards ; (2) by the explanation that the prophet Moses was acting with a view to the mystery of the nuptials of Christ and the Church. Irenæus has preserved the argument for us as follows :

> ' By the nuptials of Moses, those spiritual nuptials of the Logos were intimated ; and by his Ethiopian wife, the Church from the Gentiles was shown forth ; and those who talk against her, and slander and make mock of her, shall not be reckoned pure (καθαροί). They shall be treated as lepers and put outside of the camp of the just.'

Irenæus is meeting objections of the primitive Puritans (καθαροί), and his retort is savage enough. Pure, indeed ! they are lepers, rather. He is referring to the story of the way Miriam, the sister of Moses, was punished for criticising her brother's marriage.

To return to our theme. *Moses acted in faith when he killed the Egyptian.* The statement is meant to meet an early objection, and may, therefore, itself be early, or even original. Now with regard to the plunder of the Egyptians and their gauds and gear. As we said, it is well known that this is one of the Marcionite objections to the morality of the Old Testament ; and Epiphanius explains that there was nothing wrong about it, since the Israelites were really only collecting wages for long years of unpaid servitude. We need not, however, spend time over Epiphanius. That we are dealing with a problem at least as old as the middle of the second century may be seen from the writings of Tertullian and Irenæus. The latter is especially interesting, for he devotes a whole chapter to the Spoiling of the Egyptians,[1] and in so doing he incorporates passages from the early Christian Father whom he calls ' the Presbyter,' who tackles the very same problem. Either, then, we have extracts from a lost *Presbyter against Marcion*, or we have a Presbyter against those who held Marcionite opinions before Marcion. Tertullian, Irenæus, and the Presbyter constitute a literature on the question of the Spoiling of the Egyptians, and it is with this literature that our second gloss must be classed. If it is not originally a part of the text, it can hardly be later than the middle of the second century. It is more simple as a solution than the laboured arguments of Irenæus, or even than those of the Presbyter.

It may, however, be worth while looking more closely into the statements of Irenæus, especially into the actual passage taken from the Presbyter in the following chapter. The underlying assumption is that the Exodus from Egypt is a type of the Exodus of the Church from among the

[1] *Adv. Haer.* lib. iv. cxxx. Mass.

Gentiles, and the Presbyter (is he Papias or some other allegorist of the time ?) says :

> 'We ought not to blame the Patriarchs and Prophets for those crimes of which the scriptures themselves accuse them, nor to become like Ham, who made mirth of his father's nakedness, and so fell under a curse ; but rather we ought to give thanks to God, since their sins were forgiven by the advent of our Lord ; and indeed they also ought to give thanks and to exult over our salvation. As for those accusations which the scriptures do not make, but only relate the events simply, it is not our business to become their accusers, nor to be wiser than our teacher, but to look for the involved type.'

The Presbyter has a simple solution for the Spoliation problem : the accounts are typical, and one must not bring railing accusations. Irenæus goes much further than this, and his extended treatment shows that the Church was in the grip of Marcion. His opponents affirm (and Irenæus does not deny it) that it was by the command of God Himself that the Israelites robbed the Egyptians of the silver and gold, the vessels and vestments which were ultimately employed in the structure and the service of the sanctuary.

> 'Qui vero exprobant et imputant, quod profecturus populus, jussu Dei, vascula omnis generis et vestimenta acceperit ab Aegyptiis, et sic abierit, ex quibus et tabernaculum factum est in eremo, ignorantes justificationes Dei et dispositiones ejus, semetipsos arguunt, *sicut et presbyter dicebat*.'

Irenæus argues that we are all of us in possession of wealth which we never acquired by our own efforts, as when we brought over with us from our Gentile days the proceeds of the Mammon of Unrighteousness into the Church. Some of it was due to the avarice of our ancestors or even of our friends. As to the Egyptians, if you come to that, they owed their life to the kindness and forethought of the patriarch Joseph ; how much was due on that account ? Then there is the long tale of toil, and of servitude ; what harm if they did take a little ? If they had been let alone, they would have become rich, and could have carried off a great deal. Do not we ourselves get something (yes ! and a very great deal) from quarters where nothing was due. Think of the Romans, from whom we have the peace of our time, and the right to come and go, by land or sea, without let or hindrance ! If we get so much for nothing, it is about time for us, when we talk of the Egyptians being spoiled, to begin to pick out the chip from our own eyes. We shall only excuse the fault-finding critic who gets nothing from any one, and stands wholly unindebted to the rest of the world, if he goes off into the mountains (naked, if you please) and lives with the beasts and like them. Thus, and more to the same effect, in the pages of the ingenious Irenæus. It is clear from the way that he piles up his argument that he has a great deal to answer. We contrast his reasoning with the simple statement of the glossator, that 'By faith they plundered the Egyptians, when they went out from among them.'

Tertullian meets the Marcionite objection in something the same manner as Irenæus, but he makes a legal statement of the situation between Israelite and Egyptian, just as if he had been engaged on one side of the case in the law courts, as follows (*C. Marcion*, ii. 20) :

> 'The Egyptians put in a claim on the Hebrews for those gold and silver vessels. The Hebrews assert a counter-claim, alleging that, by the written engagement of both parties, there were due to them the arrears of that laborious slavery of theirs, for the bricks they had so painfully made, and the cities and palaces which they had built. . . . It would not be compensation enough, even if the labour of 500,000 men should be valued at only a farthing a day apiece,' and so on ; a pretty statement from a lawyer's point of view.

In Marcion's case the reference to the Spoliation of the Egyptians was made not merely to draw attention to an act of injustice involved in the Israelite history, but also to the contradiction between the God of the Old Testament and the good God of the New Testament. The case is stated for us in the *Dialogue* of Adamantius, which is the nearest we can get to Marcion's own utterances ; in this *Dialogue* we find the Marcionite Megethius contending as follows :

> 'The God of Creation commanded Moses when going forth from the land of Egypt, saying : "Be ready, with your loins girt, your feet shod, and staves in hand, with your wallets on your shoulders, and carry off gold, silver, and everything else from the Egyptians" ; but our Lord, the Good One, when sending out his disciples into the world, said, "No shoes on your feet, no wallet, no change of shirts, no money in your pockets." See how the Good One contradicts the rules of the other.'—Adamantius, *Dial.* 10.

So much for the Marcionite and anti-Marcionite points of view. For an Oriental justification of the right of plunder see Tabari, *Book of Religion and Empire* (ed. Mingana) (p. 155).

> 'And Moses—peace be with him . . . when he ordered the Children of Israel to leave Egypt and

go away, he told them that the Most High God had ordered that every one of them should borrow the garments of his neighbour and acquaintance and the jewels of their wives and daughters, and that they should inform them that it was for the occasion of one of their feasts. The Egyptian people yielded to them, adorned the Israelites with what they had, and lent them both their useful and necessary things. . . . The owners of these borrowed objects, and their wives and daughters, were deprived of their loaned articles; and their treasures, a griffin carried them away; and they bit their fingers out of regret. All this was not unlawful and illicit, but was simply the right of booty and spoils, for the world belongs to the Most High God, and its Kingdom and ornaments belong to those of His servants upon whom He bestows them, as He said in His book: "Thou givest the Kingdom to whomsoever thou pleasest, and strippest the Kingdom from whomsoever thou pleasest." '

It is not necessary to assume that Tabari, who had apostatized from Christianity to Islam, had Marcionite statements (*pro* or *con*) before him: the ethical problem is more general than that raised by Marcion.

Now let us return to the first of our pair of glosses, which we have conjectured to come from the same hand.

The first thing we notice is that there is a repetition in the text when the gloss is inserted: as we commonly read it, we have as follows:

'By faith Moses, when he was full-grown (*μέγας γενόμενος*), refused to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, choosing rather to suffer affliction with the people of God than to enjoy the pleasures of sin for a season, counting the reproach of Christ greater wealth than the treasures of Egypt, for he had respect to the recompense of the reward.'

To this we now add:

'By faith Moses, when he was full-grown (*μέγας γενόμενος*), killed the Egyptian, observing the humiliation of his brethren.'

Now to which of these accounts does the term 'full-grown' properly belong? If we turn to the underlying narration in Exodus, we find in the text of the LXX as follows:

'And it came to pass after those many days that Moses, *now full-grown*, went out to his brethren the children of Israel; and *when he had observed their pain* (*κατανοήσας τὸν πόνον αὐτῶν*), he sees an Egyptian striking a Hebrew, one of his own brethren of the children of Israel.'

Here it is clear that the term 'when full-grown' belongs to the murder of the Egyptian. Further, it does not belong to the relation with Pharaoh's daughter, for, according to Josephus, this refusal of the royalty of Egypt *took place when Moses was a child*. We should accordingly expect that the Biblical text would begin with: 'By faith Moses, when he was little' (*ὅτε μικρὸς ἦν* or *ὅτε νέος ἦν*); and that the reference to his being full-grown should come later, in which case there is a strong argument for giving the gloss a place in the text. We should then have the sequence: 'Moses when he was born . . .' 'Moses when he was *young* . . .' 'Moses when he was full-grown.'

In that connexion we notice a peculiar dependence of the language of the gloss upon the text of the LXX. The Greek of the gloss is known to us from the Codex Claromontanus (D), and it is, as we have said before, suspect of Latinism. Over against *τὴν ταπείνωσιν τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ* we have the Latin version '*dolorem* fratum ejus.' Now this *dolorem* is again from the LXX, and answers to *τὸν πόνον αὐτῶν*. Probably *κατανοῶν* is also a Latinism for *κατανοήσας*.

The conclusion, then, is that the gloss is a Latin gloss, which may answer to a primitive passage in the text of Hebrews, and is certainly of very great antiquity: and as the two glosses belong to the same mint, what is said of one of them belongs also to the other.

If neither of them is a part of the original text, then *both* of them are anti-Marcionite additions to the text of Hebrews, and were inserted in early Latin copies in the first instance. It would be another case of what we note in the famous Western glosses of the Acts, that, if not a part of the text, they are certainly a part of the very earliest commentary upon the text.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Learning to Pass.

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Glasgow.

'Ready to distribute.'—1 Ti 6[18].

This is the story of a very remarkable football team. Its name is not in any famous league, nor has it, so far as I know, ever won any celebrated cup. But it is a very remarkable team for all that. Its home is Beyrout in Syria, and it was organized by a young Scottish missionary. The centre-forward is an American, the forwards on either wing are Turks; a couple of Jews, a Negro, a Copt, and a few other international odds and ends make up a mixture that makes you think of the Tower of Babel. It sounds like mixing oil and water, or, rather, fire and gunpowder; for Turks and Armenians have been bitter enemies for centuries and are so still, and both dislike Jews, and all despise Negroes. Yet, there they were playing together in the same football team instead of trying to kill each other. What was it that made them lay aside old hatreds and old scorn like this? It wasn't just the fascination of football. Perhaps that drew them closer together and made them better friends; but it was something else which drew them together to begin with, and made them friends who had been so long enemies.

There is only one power that can work that sort of miracle, the power of Jesus. They were Christians. They had become friends with each other because each had first found a friend in Jesus. He is the Great Friend, and the first effect of His spirit in men is to make them friendly.

Now, then, do you know what was the most difficult thing for the missionary to teach them? It was to teach them *to pass the ball to one another.* Each one was eager to get the ball at his toe, to dart down the field and score a goal himself; and when the missionary had got a man to understand that he must play not for himself and his own glory, but for the team, when he had taught him to pass, he knew he had done a good bit of work not only for the team but for the man's own life. And that is just what we all need to learn in the greater game of life. St. Paul says Christians must be 'ready to distribute.' That just means that they must learn to pass. The world to-day is unhappy and anxious, because every nation is playing its own game. They are fixed on their own plans. They want to mend the world in their own way. They want to score the goals and gather the glory single-handed.

This won't do in football. The selfish player spoils the team. The 'inside' that starves his wing man and won't pass must learn or he will find himself dropped. And it won't do in life, and things will never be right until each nation forgets itself and denies itself, looks 'not on its own things but on the things of others,' and all pull together for the good of all. Then the League of Nations will be a team; it is not a team yet.

In our own nation we see the same thing. We were one nation in the war, pulling together like one team, all ready to give up something for the sake of the nation. That is how we and our allies won the war. The splendid thing was when that great and good man, General Haig, offered to serve under General Foch. Now we are all at sixes and sevens again—miners, engineers, railway men, employers, workmen—each determined to score for himself, and nobody scoring at all for that very reason. It isn't a team when every man is playing for his own hand and won't pass to the next man; and we are not really a nation to-day in the full and perfect sense. We are just a lot of jostling people, not playing the game, not 'ready to distribute.'

This is the master secret for us all. The great lesson is to learn to pass. If you have comfort, it is not yours only. Pass it on. There are others being starved in the wings because you don't pass to them. They lose heart and drop out of the game discouraged. Pass on your comforts—your friendship, your money, your sympathy—pass, and play the game for the team and not for yourself. This is the spirit of Jesus. It is what He did, and being a Christian means being 'ready to distribute.'

Look farther than our own nation. We have good news to pass on, the good news of the love of God that has come to us through Jesus Christ. This is not for ourselves alone; it is for the world. There are millions in the world who know nothing about it. Pass it on to them. This is what we call 'Foreign Missions'; I call it 'Playing the Game.' These heathen folk are being starved

of what they have a right to, and a great need of.

God wants us all to be one, working like a team, all the nations together for God, all the people in each nation together for God, all for each and each for all. We are too fond of 'my' and 'mine,' but when Jesus taught His disciples to pray He left these words out and told them to use 'our'—'*our* father, *our* daily bread, *our* trespasses.'

And listen to the way St. Paul talks—'ready to distribute,' 'bear one another's burdens,' 'members one of another'—that is a team playing together under one Captain, Christ. 'If I come to Jesus,' we sing in a hymn, 'He will make me glad.' How? By teaching us to pass. It is the first lesson He will teach, it is the hardest to learn thoroughly, and it is the most worth learning, for it is the key that opens the door to an immense treasure of gladness.

Submarines.

By the Reverend T. Crouther Gordon, D.F.C., B.D., Pitlochry.

'Whatsoever passeth through the paths of the seas.'—Ps 8[8].

One of the great things that passes through the sea is the submarine. You remember some months ago the H.29 sank when she was in her harbour. We were all very sorry when we learned that some of the crew were drowned. It brought back to us what happened during the war.

One day I was taken down in a submarine. It was lying in Portsmouth, and when we got aboard the commander took us out into the sea, and, when we were out of sight of land, he bolted up the conning-tower and barred up the holes, and then we sank farther and farther into the water. For a time we could see through the periscope, and we watched the waves passing over us, but soon the periscope too was under the water, and we could see nothing. Then the commander explained to us one or two of the instruments. One instrument, he said, tells me the speed I am going at. Another tells me if there is any ship near me, and this one tells me how deep I am. I stood watching this instrument. It had a large dial and a long pointer, and every second the pointer went farther and farther down. Ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty, sixty feet. We could breathe easily, there was plenty of air, there was nothing to tell us, except the pointer, that we were sixty feet below the waves. We did not feel ourselves going down, but the pointer told us.

And you and I, boys and girls, like the submarine, may go down and down, and yet not feel ourselves going down. You may think you are just as good as the next boy. He swears, and, when his father is not looking, he smokes too. He can tell as tall a story as you can. But, if you will just look at the pointer in your heart, you will see it pointing very low. And that pointer is your conscience.

In the middle of the submarine I noticed a seat. It was not like an ordinary chair. It was for all the world like a music-stool. And about three feet above the stool there was the bottom of the periscope, and there was a handle on each side of it for swinging it round. Now the commander of the submarine, when he is watching for the enemy, sits on that stool and swings the periscope round. And this lets him see all the ships that are near him on the ocean. But although he can see all round about him with the periscope, he cannot see straight above him. Now this is dangerous, for a seaplane might be flying right above him, and, before he could see it, it might drop bombs and destroy his boat. You see how very serious it might be for him and all the crew, because he could not see straight up.

And there are a great many boys and girls just like the commander in the submarine. They look round about them, but they do not look straight up, and they forget that God is watching them from heaven. And this leads to all kinds of evil. They do mean things, they say mean things about their chums, they let down their side when they are playing games. *You* don't do that, but boys and girls very like you do it. But if you will look straight up to God every night and every morning, you will keep clear of all trouble.

We were all very sad about the sinking of the H.29 submarine, but what made it very much sadder was that it sank just where it was lying in the harbour. It had come home from its cruise, and the damage was not done in the angry ocean, but when she was at home moored to the dock. She sank at her moorings.

I once knew a boy who lived in a house, and the name of the house was 'The Moorings.' Now you are living at home, and that is your mooring. But the sad thing is this, that so many are sinking just at their moorings. Not at school, where the teacher keeps them from talking, and where they dare not tell lies, but at home where we can go into a room all by ourselves and nobody sees us, and do things that we never tell to mother. Home, that is the place where you make your little sister do

what you want, because you say she is just your sister. It is at home that you lie in bed when you ought to be going to school. It is at home that you sit over the fire reading a detective story when you should be doing your sum until you get it out right. And so you must be very careful that you do not get lazy or fall into nasty habits, because, though it is sad that, like the submarine, you should sink and come to ruin, it is sadder still that you should sink into sin in your own home.

The Christian Year.

Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity.

The Eyes of Purity.

'Come and see.'—Jn 1^{39}.

'Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.'—Mt 5^{8}.

'Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God.' So Jesus reveals the condition of the beatific vision, and sets us in that cleft, more surely scored than that wherein Moses gazed on the retreating procession of God, from which we may look up and see God face to face.

1. What is this thing Purity? The answer is to be found in those Scriptures which the word and spirit of Christ inspired. It is both negatively described and positively revealed. In its negative aspect it is certainly *the negation of all that goes by the name of fleshly Lust.* The carnally impure see not God. Their passions create a red mist, which, though it be as rosy as the light in the cavern of the Venusberg in which Tannhäuser tarried, hides the face of God. This truth is native to the human spirit. The endeavour of our race to reach the wisdom and communion of eternal things is starred throughout its course with the forlorn conviction that they must be clean who would enter those holy mysteries. Humanity is in thrall to this conviction, and knows that all that is said by those who deride the Christian ideal of purity is given the lie by the oracles of its own heart.

'You complain of Catholicism,' said Chesterton's Mac Ian to the very modern Turnbull, 'for setting up an ideal of virginity; it did nothing of the kind. The whole human race set up an ideal of virginity: the Greeks in Athene, the Romans in the Vestal fire.'

It is this innate conviction in the race, that purity is the threshold of the shrine, and the shekinah that lights up God for us, which comes to its flower in the Christian revelation. Have you never been struck by the way in which the New Testament links together such impurities as adultery, uncleanness, fornication, lasciviousness, and the like, with idolatry. Now the idolater does not see God; the block on which he gazes is a stumbling-block in the way of that holy vision. But let us detect this further, that, as those Scriptures reveal it to us, the idolater is set about by these impurities, and it is by their feverish hands the idol is so lifted up that the stars among which God waits for us are all obscured. Tennyson, in his Idyll of 'The Holy Grail,' makes very sure of this. It was impurity that barred from Sir Lancelot the vision of the Cup, that symbol and vehicle of the very blood of God. All that was 'pure, noble, and knightly' in him 'twined and clung round that one sin, until the wholesome flower and poisonous grew together, each as each, not to be pluck'd asunder.' Even when he came to Castle Carboneh, down the hall of which the Cup floated in luminous air, it was veiled from Lancelot. 'A stormy glare, a heat as from a seven-times-heated furnace, blasted and burned and blinded' him. It was his own heart heated with his unexorcised passion that bred that blinding storm!

2. But now let us note that Purity means freedom from other humours than lust. It means also *freedom from Pride.* No man who regards himself as sufficient for himself may hope to 'see God.' Still less if his pride be that of material possessions and worldly pomps in which he has laid up his soul. 'Pride,' as one has written, 'is a weakness in the character; it dries up laughter, it dries up wonder, it dries up chivalry and energy.' With such drought the wells of God dry up for a man, and he beholds no more than a mirage of fountains among their groves. Thus it is that many thinkers of our own day cannot see more of God than a dream that the world had of Him in its superstitious childhood, or a dream which the Universe in its slow labour is 'unconsciously' trying to bring true. They cannot because of pride, an intellectual self-sufficiency which limits the things that man may know in heaven and earth to their own philosophy. They lack that humility and selfless reverence by which alone Truth comes with her sensitive approach within our compass. St. Peter in his Epistle declares that we purify our souls by obedience to the truth. So; but it is by purifying our minds from pride that we first of all address ourselves to that 'obedience.' All revelations come only to those who, as Maeterlinck says, accustom themselves 'to live like an angel who has just sprung to life, like a woman who loves, or a man on the point of death.' In these moods there is no

room for self-sufficiency. And the vision of God needs that vacancy of the proud self more than all else. No one may hope to have even a 'sense of God,' to use William Watson's phrase, until he banishes pride in himself:

> When, overarched by gorgeous night,
> I wave my trivial self away;
> When all I was to all men's sight
> Shares the erasure of the day;
> Then do I cast my cumbering load,
> Then do I gain a sense of God.

3. In the third place, Purity means *freedom from Scorn*. The flavour of this spirit grieves us in the words of those who, having 'outgrown' the antique and workaday conception of 'God,' seem content to wander among those half-formed shapes and incipient divinities which whisper about their self-sufficient minds, and call to them dumbly in the twilight created by their own thought. They carry themselves scornfully to the 'humble and meek,' and so sterilize their own fields. At times their scorn becomes hate. Jesus was subjected to this. 'They have seen,' said He, 'and they have hated both me and my Father.' Scorn is the flavour of the greater part of Thomas Hardy's treatment of those who will not and cannot share his bleak agnosticism. No doubt he has kindlier moods, but he has so overborne those childlike thoughts in his heart, and set forth their dead bodies with gentle scorn, that that revelation which is denied to the 'wise and learned,' but revealed to babes and the 'simple-minded,' has passed him by.

Childlikeness, 'simple-mindedness,' humility, a heart that brings all its native simplicity of response to the light which shines behind the commonplace—these are the positive elements in that purity by which we 'see God.' It is a spirit which tends to shepherds telling of what they saw and heard on the hills, as readily as to princes of learning who come over to us, purged of their faith, in the wake of 'the high, white star of Truth.' It is a spirit which seeks the oracle of the Academy or the Porch with no humbler a reverence than it shows to a teacher of little tales about sheep and shepherds, sowing and reaping, sparrows and daffodils, women cleaning houses or baking bread. It is true that this vagrant prophet begat a superstition which has filled the earth with temples, books, worships, and incredible adventures. But what good thing can come out of Galilee? Whatever it be need not concern us! Thus those who assume the leadership of thought among us pass Christ by.

It is this attitude of quiet contempt or sheer ignorance where the Galilean is concerned that hinders these men from 'seeing God.' They have not yet sufficiently learned the fundamental lesson about God, that it is the 'pure in heart' who see Him. Some of them, like Huxley, have learned well that the scientific mind cannot read the truth of a flower, or find the law that is held in a child's daisy-chain, unless they 'sit down before it like a little child.' But they have yet to try that scientific method towards Christ. How many of them do so? They read books, many or few, that are critical of religion, or they hear of Christ by the weary hearing of the ear. But as for going face to face with Him as He gathers the childlike about Him in the Gospels, that is the last thing many of them have ever thought of doing. If they will but do so, and suffer their soul to *take* upon itself the direct glow and impress of His soul, with no other spirit of submission than they offer when they sit with Huxley before the face of Nature, *they shall in Christ see God*! They shall know that they have reached God.

Whoever or whatever God be, we have all come forth from Him. We live in Him as intimately, surely, as the animalcule lives in our body. Every breath we draw depends on the pulse that beats out its vital rhythm from the heart that throbs in the Innermost. Can it be, therefore, that we should light at any time or anywhere upon the home and heart of this our parentage, and not know that we had discovered it? It cannot be. It cannot be that a bird of the air knows by the prompting of its homing heart when and where it has come home, and the soul of man stand blind and irresponsive when he lights on God. It is this 'instinct,' or 'intuition,' or 'sense of the holy' which knows that, in meeting Christ, God is met, that they who have seen Him have seen the Father![1]

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Value of Religious Reserve.

'See thou tell no man; but go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.'—Mt 8^4.

The Gospels are no doubt full of instances of our Lord's desire to efface Himself, to escape the foolish notoriety with which the wonder-lust of the multitude surrounds every true greatness to its real

[1] A. Boyd Scott, *The Twelve Take Stock of Us*, 53.

belittlement. Yet there is surely something more in the deliberate gravity of this command. It is not of Himself He is thinking, but of the man to whom He speaks. It is a lesson, not a request. It is the lesson of religious reserve and religious sincerity.

Every religious experience is profoundly real and personal. And just because it is so, it will feel the tug of two conflicting impulses, neither of which is to be immediately trusted. It will want to declare itself, and it will want to hide itself. Everything that touches what is most personal in us comes as a renewal. A great joy that comes to us apart from our deserts or beyond them, a great purpose that takes possession of us, a great success which, however much it may have been hoped for, will always seize us with the sense of the unexpected—these things renew us, or we are incapable of being renewed. But indeed there is none of us such a clod as not to feel the thrill of a new life, however feeble, however evanescent, through such visitings. And even a great sorrow or a great failure will try whether there is life in us to be renewed or only the hopeless dulness of a stagnant spirit to be more painfully endured than before. And if renewal comes, however it comes, it wants to express itself. It is an expansive moment, and at the same time it is a morbid moment—a moment both of feverish self-expression and of unhealthy reserve. At such times we would say everything and say nothing; we would take the world into our confidence and again withdraw into a moody and stubborn loneliness of spirit.

Both moods are dangerous, or rather would be dangerous if they could prove permanent. They both witness to the soul's concern about itself. They may be innocent and harmless in that moment of the renewal of life. But they have no permanent correspondence with the stern and somewhat prosaic demands of life as a whole. And so it is well that from the beginning we should be taught to avoid them or rather to conquer them. And that was our Lord's lesson to the leper whom He had healed. He knew the inevitable impulse which would drive the poor victim of a loathsome disease, who suddenly found himself clean, to proclaim abroad the great miracle of his cleansing. He knew, too, the vacancy of spirit, of will, which the very excess of joy can induce in us. And so He uttered the double warning: 'See thou tell no man; but go, shew thyself to the priest and make the customary offering.'

Do we not feel the general significance of this warning? All strength is full of a noble reserve. And the feeling that would acquire strength and self-certainty must learn this lesson of reserve. Our Lord indeed spoke only to the need of a particular moment. When He said, 'See thou tell no man,' He was not counselling a habitual secretiveness. For such secretiveness is the reserve of the cowardly or the cunning. The nature that is sure of itself needs no concealment and has no temptations to concealment. There is a splendid freedom and a fine appropriateness in all its self-revelation. It is incapable of weak concealment and of weaker boasting. But it is when one is learning to be strong that it is necessary to keep watch on the waywardness of the spirit. It is then that we need to remember our Lord's counsel, 'See thou tell no man.' For to that stage in the soul's growth it was directed. It is the moment when self-expression may too easily become self-betrayal. We may think we are only uttering a spontaneous gratitude. But when we give ourselves time to think, when we have gained the power of dealing sincerely with ourselves and look back upon that moment of expression, we recognize in it the momentary intoxication of an unworthy vanity. It was of ourselves we were thinking, of the something great that had happened to us. It was not the miracle of renewing power in itself that had impressed us. It was the fact that we were the objects of it. It was that which had unloosed our tongues and at the same time had weakened the real reverence in our hearts.

Are not much religious profession and confession of this puny kind? We dare not, indeed, make loose charges against any particular form of religious expansiveness. But at least let us be sure for ourselves that we never dare to speak of the things that have come to have the most profound meaning for us till the need comes which we dare not resist, till silence would prove itself a greater betrayal than speech. And let us honour the great silent natures about us from whose lips we have never heard any of the current religious phrases, but whose quiet steadfast lives have so often been our reproof and our inspiration.

But, it may be argued, the great religious teachers were not afraid to urge their own experience upon their disciples. If they had been they would never have made disciples. St. Paul's teaching is surely personal enough. It might seem, indeed, at times to be an almost extravagant insistence upon what he himself had felt. He seems unable to recommend a general truth save through what had been immediately personal to himself. It is true, and more than that, it is doubtful whether

any religious teacher has ever spoken with effect save out of his own personal certainties. Yet St. Paul provides the very example to which we would appeal in support of what has been said. For in him the personal has become the universal, and it has become somehow the universal pleading with each. If he speaks of himself, it is not that we may take note of him personally, it is that we may see in him what we can be and have and know, it is that we may feel through him who has known it something that is the common need and hope of humanity. The secret of St. Paul is that when he speaks of himself most directly, when he places himself in the very centre of the picture, he has entirely forgotten himself, he hardly knows that he exists or counts. 'Not I, but Christ that dwelleth in me.'

The merely individual experience, the experience which feels its separateness, rejoices in it, and exposes itself lightly, does not exist in St. Paul's religion. His is the experience which has ceased to be merely individual and become truly personal, representative of what a broadly human experience may be and ought to be. For the personal is the note of the Divine life, of the life that can be wholly itself and yet can enter into communion with all other life that is; and we never completely attain it. The individual is the note of unregenerate human life, of the life that cannot be itself at all without insisting on its separateness; and we never wholly escape it. And all the genuine religious experience of the human soul is an ascent from the merely individual to the truly personal. Here is the key to the true and worthy religious reserve.

And again there is great meaning in that other counsel of our Lord's, 'Go and shew thyself to the priest and make the offering that is customary.' It is the temptation of every religious feeling which is at all really individual to be self-sufficient. It tends to ignore customary religious forms, to feel itself magnificently independent of them. There seems to it something cold and insufficient in their formal routine. Yet it is just then that the soul needs the correction and discipline which they can supply. We need to be humbled by the bracing discipline of the common levels.

'Go thy way, shew thyself to the priest, and offer the gift that Moses commanded, for a testimony unto them.' Only that, and yet, if we obey, we will learn that the renewal which might have proved fruitless and illusory is at last beginning to accomplish itself in us in earnest.[1]

[1] A. L. Lilley, *The Religion of Life*, 34.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

HARVEST SERMON.

God's Disapproval of a Grudging Spirit.

'When thou cuttest down thine harvest in thy field, and hast forgot a sheaf in the field, thou shalt not go again to fetch it: it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, and for the widow; that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all the work of thine hands.' —Dt 24^{19}.

It is quite evident, to any one who reads the Book of Deuteronomy with attention, that it was written for people who were still in touch with country life. It deals with a state of things which has not yet become too complicated. The people to whom it addresses itself in the name of God—and this it does with a frankness which is very refreshing in these more sophisticated days of ours—are not very numerous. It is still possible to reduce all moral and religious life to a few plain precepts. At a later stage, when a population has come within sight of other civilizations and manners, words have lost their first meaning, and people's minds have become so subtle, so full of excellent arguments for whatever course suits themselves, that they cannot—unless in certain dark and tragical hours—feel the one tremendous call of life, the one holy and inevitable meaning which alone gives sense and substance to this human scene.

There are a few simple rules which have been right from the beginning, rules which it will always be necessary for us to observe if we would please God and have the comfort of our own thoughts. Always be careful when you hear it said of some simple old rule, that 'times are changed,' that what was once excellent enough is now no longer suitable! Times are changed; but human hearts are scarcely changed at all. A good man in our day is very like what a good man must have been in the time of Moses. Goodness is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. You may dash along the streets or along our railways at a speed which would have astonished our simple ancestors and put them for a moment at a disadvantage; but the moment you alight, the moment you are tempted to commit a sin, the moment you beat your breast over some sin committed, the moment you meet some disaster in the region of your love or your fortune, the moment you become aware of your own *self*—in that moment you are the same. Since God first spoke to man the rules for the true life have not been changed. All that has happened is that we have to play our part in other circumstances.

Therefore let us be on our guard when we are

told that some old rule for good-living is no longer applicable to our case, that some fine action which used to be the sign of a beautiful and religious spirit is not incumbent upon people like ourselves in these present days. 'When thou reapest thine harvest in thy field, and hast forgot a sheaf in the field, thou shalt not go again to fetch it: it shall be for the stranger, for the fatherless, for the widow; that the Lord thy God may bless thee in all the work of thine hands.'

A verse like that takes us back in a moment to man's simple days; it may be to our own simpler days. For one moment we see golden fields, and the labour and the joy of harvest.

When the people of God were at that stage in their long career, here is a rule which God laid upon them—a rule which their own conscience must have accepted as good. When a man was clearing a field of grain, if he happened to forget a sheaf, he must *leave* it—and the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow should have it. A man is not asked deliberately to leave one sheaf behind—for the poor: that would have been the very opposite of the spirit of this law. He is not asked to look about him as the last load is leaving his field, and to say, 'Ah, yes, I see I have left one sheaf behind'—and then to go away, as though by leaving that one miserable sheaf he had discharged all his obligations to the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow. If you consult the laws of Moses you will find that very much more was expected of any man who claimed to be a good man.

Imagine for a moment the condition of the man who—knowing this law of his God with regard to the forgotten sheaf—goes back to fetch it. He has set out for the last time from his field walking by the side of his waggon. He has that tired and happy feeling which comes in the evening after a good day's work. God, too, has crowned the year with His goodness. So the man walks on, making melody in his heart unto the Lord—now and then cheering on his patient beast with some playful word. So they go on, the man and the beast and the golden grain, just as God, from all eternity, had proposed. Suddenly he comes to a standstill. He summons his beast to halt—he remembers that he has forgotten a sheaf! So back they go, man and beast, and grain no longer golden, but dull with the growing darkness. He finds the gate, passing some of the poor people—the strangers, the fatherless, and the widow—who had come to gather up the crumbs that had fallen from his table! For a moment he is uneasy; but he recalls his own excellent point about encouraging strangers, and passes doggedly on. He finds his sheaf, flings it on the top of the waggon, beats his poor beast—as though it were to blame—and hastens homewards. But there is no song now in his breast!

We are not farmers, but there is something in that old rule or custom which we must find out for ourselves as applying to ourselves. Every word which God ever spoke to man *stands*. It abides in spirit. And what is the spirit, the permanent challenge and demand of that ancient law of early Israel? It is just this: that we are all of us to practise a certain open-handedness in life. We are not to squeeze the last penny out of life—for our own sakes. We are not to make the great error—that we are here to wring out of life the last drop that will minister to our luxury or to our ambition. On the contrary, we are here to sit loosely to the world, thanking God if we have what we really need. We live in a world of men without whose friendship and assistance there are dark places in life which we should never pass alone. We are here not simply in order that we may get home in the evening with everything that we can legally claim and can heap up on our waggon. On the contrary, when all is said, we are here to leave something behind! To every man God has given a field on which to labour—until the evening. And God knows that we ourselves have need of bread and raiment. But unhappy surely is the man who, in order to minister to his own vanity, in order to promote his own ease and luxuriousness, leaves behind him a barren track as though a plague of locusts had passed that way!

It may not have been a good thing for those strangers, for those fatherless people and those widows, to learn to depend upon farmers leaving sheaves behind them in the fields. It may indeed have been a very bad thing for them, encouraging them in indolence and destroying their independence—although the Bible has little to say in praise of what we call 'independence.' And it may have been, socially, a harmful practice—this leaving of sheaves. But that is not the point. The point is that no man can look at himself with comfort who, having forgotten a sheaf, and remembering that poor people are looking for it, goes back—though his waggon is already laden—to fetch it.

Our blessed Lord once spoke a parable of a poor man sitting begging at a rich man's door. Our Lord did not there encourage begging. All that He did in that parable was to rebuke a man's hardness of heart. All that He did was to follow in imagination that hard-hearted man into a place

of utter loneliness where he could not but think of himself and of the miserable thing he had done.[1]

SEVENTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

After Summer.

'The summer is ended.'—Jer 8^{20}.

We are all more or less sensitive to our environment, influenced and impressed by the scenery that is about us. The days are different; the seasons come and go; and in the changing face of Nature we find the mirror of our moods, the reflection of our experiences. When autumn days are here, the gladness and glee of the year have gone, and there is a tender sadness over the landscape. The corn is all cut and carried away; and we look across the pale stubble-fields, bare and empty—all stripped of their abundant loveliness; and we know that there has passed a glory from the earth. 'The summer is ended.'

Let us take one or two thoughts that such a word brings to us.

1. 'The summer is ended.' That is true, but let us thank God that we have seen another summer. It is something to be thankful for. No doubt, our first thought is the thought of what is gone. It is the difference between spring and autumn, like the difference between morning and evening. The glory of morning is that the light is breaking and growing and coming, and all the bright hours are yet before us. But when evening comes, the light is fading, diminishing, and the shadows creep on. So in the spring-time we live in hope for all the glory that is yet to be. There comes to us the promise of the summer with its wealth of life and beauty, its long, light, lovely days. But in autumn we think of what is gone.

'The summer is ended.' We have seen it; and what a season it has been of bounty and of beauty. We can remember days when it was good to be alive, out on the hills or by the sea, in field and wood, the sunshine and the skies, the sweet air, the radiant health, the verdure and the loveliness of trees and flowers. God gave us such summer days. Have we thanked Him for them? Such a world it is, telling of His delight in His creation and the love with which He loves us. 'The earth is full of the goodness of the Lord,' and of this fulness have all we received. Ended? Yes; but we have seen it again, seen it come and go, another spring and summer, the bloom and freshness, the wonder and delight. And in our brief life it means much. Henry Ryecroft writes in his *Journal*, after he had retired to the country: 'How many more springs can I hope to see? A sanguine temper would say ten or twelve; let me dare to hope humbly for five or six; that is a great many. Five or six spring-times welcomed joyously, lovingly watched from the first celandine to the budding of the rose, who shall dare to call it a stinted boon? Five or six times the miracle of earth reclad, the vision of splendour and loveliness which tongue has never yet described set before my gazing. To think of it is to fear that I ask too much.'

'Forget not all his benefits.' It is a great boon to be here alive and to have seen another summer.

2. Another thought is this. 'The summer is ended,' and we know what comes next. The year changes from sunny skies and soft showers and warm winds to storms and snows. But the gladness and the good have not gone from us. Winter has its own beauty and its own keen, eager life. Certainly the winter landscape has a loveliness all its own; and when we step out into the frosty air, or when we battle bravely against wind and rain, we feel the bracing influence of harder weather. The keen air does not depress; it quickens and invigorates. Frosty, but kindly, are the winter days, and soon we lose the sense of gloom and still rejoice. It is not difficult to see that for our health and vigour, and for our highest life, we need what winter brings to us. How clear the contrast between the races of tropical countries, self-indulgent and indolent, and those who are trained and disciplined in the more rugged and severe climate of the North!

It is this season, too, that gives us all our indoor life. Indeed, 'home' is a northern word—a word not found in sultry, southern climes, not found where men are living out of doors. Only among those whom the cold drives to seek shelter and retreat, only at the hearth where the winter fire is kindled and the family gathered—there we know the life, the fellowship, the intimate bonds of love that make us live together and be at home.

We should not complain of our rugged climate. There is a moral influence in the severity after the softness; and we may thank God for the frosts and snows and sleets and bleak winds, even as when we see such changes reflected in our life, in hardship and suffering and adverse fortune. There are mild and genial influences under which we may expand and grow; but there are also influences that are helpful though hard, kindly though cold.

3. 'The summer is ended.' For most of us it means this too—coming home again, and coming

[1] J. A. Hutton, in *Harvest Thanksgiving Sermons*, 131.

home to our work. The holiday is past—the time of lighter, freer life; and we face the winter—the time of more steady, settled, strenuous work. We shrink a little from the first plunge into it. We know the feeling of the first days in the collar. But still we know that this is good—for life is work.

It is essential to any real welfare of spirit, essential to healthy-mindedness, that we should have a clear perception and a hearty acceptance of the work God gives us to do, finding in it what gives substance and value, dignity and nobleness to life. It is good to sit in the sunshine, to wander over moor and shore enjoying those hours of freedom and repose which are so healthful and so happy. But it is not enough. We find ourselves thinking of our work, looking forward to the winter days, planning some better method, cherishing a deeper desire to work well. We cannot satisfy ourselves with sport and play and pleasure. It is not these that contribute the elements of real strength and worth to our life. And it is good that we should remind ourselves of this when 'the summer is ended,' and our work is again in our hands.

We measure our life most truly when we are looking back upon it. And this is the only reflection and remembrance that awaken a satisfaction deep in the heart: 'I have finished the work.' Life is work and play, and there are just two kinds of life. There is one that makes the work less than the play—when we work in order that we may play. There is another that makes the play second to the work—when we play in order that we may work better.

4. Take this last reflection which is the thought of the text. 'The summer is ended'; another season has passed.

The text has an interesting meaning here which few of those who repeat it think of. It has most likely a political reference. Threatened by the great power of Assyria, the land of Judah was looking to Egypt for help, but the help did not come. The summer days passed. The time of campaigning was over. Kings do not go forth to war in winter. The long summer went past and there was no sign of help. The prophet hears the cry of the captive people, carried away by the victorious invader, because the hopes they cherished had been cherished in vain as they looked to Egypt through the summer months and no help came. 'The summer is ended, and we are not saved.'

But the words have passed into our common speech as a cry of despair over lost chances, seasons that have come and gone and been missed or misspent.

It is evidently true of the harvest. It is like another proverb taken from agriculture: 'Make hay while the sun shines.' It carries the same lesson of opportunity to be swiftly, diligently used or lost for ever. Harvests must be reaped in harvest-time. And it is true of our passing life. Like the year life is a succession of times and seasons, each of which has its destined work; and that being done, all is well; that left undone, all is not well.

God gives us our times—seed-time and harvest, and summer and winter. This is the Divine discipline under which we live. Large opportunities are put in our way, and it is left with ourselves whether we shall use them or neglect them. There is no coercion to compel us to turn them to account; and the wheels of time will not be reversed to bring them back once they are gone. There are measured opportunities in life—soon spent, easily lost, never recovered. What a wonderful gift is this of time! A little section cut out of eternity and given us to do our work in, the season in which we are saved or lost. Do we not feel it more and more with every returning season when 'the summer is ended' and the year sinks to its close? It may seem safe enough in spring-time to laugh and sing and play when every day brings summer nearer, when every day is longer than the day that went before it. But life has another aspect when the autumn leaves are falling and the winter storms begin. We realize that life is going from us; and life is opportunity. It is 'this thy day,' and if we miss it, our day is done.[1]

[1] J. Rutherford, *The Seer's House*, 307.

The Education of Jesus.

By the Reverend H. C. Carter, M.A., Cambridge.

We have a right to look to the facts, so far as we can know them, of the conditions under which Jesus grew up, as showing us the type of the perfect human education. For a perfect man there is needed a perfect germ of personality, and a perfect education—processes and conditions forming the

environment of his growth perfectly adapted to the drawing out of the personality and its completeness. That combination was found in the history of Jesus. May there not be more for our guidance and imitation here, in the midst of our puzzled thoughts and experimentings about education, than it has commonly occurred to us to look for? If we may know the main conditions under which the best—the infinitely best—human life grew to perfection, and if, further, we can see that those conditions are, in their principle, reproducible, is it not to be believed that the life of Jesus has been given us in this respect, as in others, for our example? If the perfect seed needs the best soil to grow in to bear the perfect flower and fruit, does the imperfect seed, of the same species, do better with another soil?

Let us then think of the great things we know—and we only know a few great things—about Jesus' education. We may distinguish six facts of importance: six influences under which He grew to perfect manhood.

1. There was first *the home into which He was born*, in which He lived all His days until His powers were fully ripe.

In after years, in order that He might fulfil the mission on which He had come into the world, Jesus abandoned His home. Perhaps, in spite of all the thought that has been bestowed upon His sufferings, enough has never been given to the cost which that renunciation meant to Him. But as we look at the earlier part of His life and ask under what conditions His powers of body and mind and spirit were developed, there stands in the forefront this fact, that Jesus grew to manhood amid the sheltering sanctities of a home. It is to the home that the Gospels first take us, and the way it was prepared for.

There was the preparation of the mother. The mistake that a great part of Christendom has made of worshipping that mother has perhaps turned away the mind of another part of it from giving her the reverence that is plainly her due. One evangelist, St. Luke, has preserved for us a picture of Mary—such as no imagination could have invented—which enables us to know, and not simply to guess, that the greatest of the sons of men was born of the best of women. Read the story again for what it tells of Mary; of how the news of her pain and honour was borne, the humility and the joy, the spirit open to the vision of God, and the tongue loosed in His praise. 'My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour. . . . From henceforth all generations shall call me blessed.' Mary was a great religious poet, with a poet-power born not made, born in the heart of simplicity and devotion. Jesus came into this world already loved in the love of God by such a mother. And for all His years in that home Jesus was by that mother's side—that mother who kept things, pondering them in her heart—learning from her lips and quiet deeds, prayed for and thought for every day, loved with the richest, deepest human mother-love.

And then there was a father in that home—Joseph, the carpenter. This only we know of Joseph, that he was chivalrous, tender, and true. The little that has been told assures us of that. How long he lived through the growing up of Jesus to do the office of human father to Him we do not know. We know that it was until He was more than twelve. They knew Jesus at Nazareth, when He was a man, by His father's name, so that father was by then at least not forgotten. 'Is not this,' they said, 'the son of Joseph?' And to forsake fact only for a moment to make a guess—can we think that when Jesus used the name of Father for the one whom He so early came to know as His true eternal Parent ('Wist ye not that I must be about my Father's business?'), He was not lifted upwards to an understanding of all that heavenly fatherhood meant through what He had known the father in His earthly home to have been? 'Which of you that is a father,' He said to the men of Galilee, 'will fail to give your children such good things as you can afford? How much more that heavenly Father?' Surely He thought of Joseph, and the kindness that had been constant in that home in Nazareth.

In that home were brothers and sisters too. What do we know of them? Nothing, except that they loved Him well enough to trouble greatly when, without true understanding, after He had left the home to do His great work, they thought He was running in paths of danger. They sought to restrain Him. We know nothing except that, and this—that they saw no wonderful sign of their brother's being more than human, as He grew up and worked and played with them in that home. They 'saw no glory crown His head.' For we read that when He came forth as a prophet 'his brethren did not believe on him.' What legend-weavers would have invented that? It bears the mark of fact.

In this home, among brothers and sisters, with all the social life such a home must mean, Jesus grew up; surrounded by the comradeship of those other boys and girls; surrounded by the love and

teaching of that mother and father. But something else—trained in obedience to that mother and father: 'He was subject unto them.' That was the early setting in which the perfect life of Jesus was developed.

2. The second leading condition of the growth of Jesus follows in close connexion with His home. He was brought up *in contact with the simplicities of human life*—its elemental needs, and difficulties, and delights.

'Give me neither poverty nor riches,' prayed the wise man. Such was the condition given to Jesus' growing manhood. It was a home where the daily bread was not scarce, but earned with labour, and received as the gracious requital of God, blessing honest toil. It was a working man's home; a home equally removed from penury and from luxury. It was a home where the boy within it had daily kept before His eyes the fact, lost sight of at great peril, that the life of man here depends upon the work that brings food out of the ground, upon the diligence and skill that shapes the raw material of nature to his needs to clothe and shelter him and give him comfort.

And Jesus was taught a trade—to do something of real and apparent use for His fellows, to make handles for their ploughs and sickles, beams and rafters for their dwellings, beds for them to lie on. 'Is not this the carpenter?' Jesus was brought up to know the need, and the delight, of simple toil; to know it under conditions where the product of a man's labour might stand beside him as its reward under conditions of freedom, where no fellow-man might command his services as of right, or own him as a 'hand'; yet under the conditions of necessity, where idleness was plainly doomed, and the law was written clear, 'If a man will not work, neither shall he eat.'

Here was another part of the setting of the growing up of Jesus—another part of that education which issued in proved perfectness of character.

3. The third thing we may see as we look at these conditions amid which Jesus grew is that this setting of His developing life was *in nearness to the works of God in Nature.* Amid all the social influences of home, and of a community which provided for the exercise of a craftsman's and a tradesman's services, He grew up nevertheless close to the fields and hills. God provided for the making of the manhood of His perfect Son a place where town and country touched each other. The Bible represents the paradise of man's innocence as a garden; but it draws the paradise of his perfectness as a garden city, where the river and the trees are in the streets. Nazareth was not a garden city; but it was a country town. Jesus was not brought up in the dark gloom of a slum, nor in the heavy grandeur of an opulent city, nor in the trim respectability of a comfortable suburb. He grew up in a little town where workers and those they worked for lived within sight of one another, where there were the problems of a town which come from people living close together, yet where the blue of the sky could be seen clear, and a man might look at the hills even from where he worked, and walk out upon them in the evening, and watch the corn grow and see the birds and hear their song.

It was at Nazareth that Jesus had seen the wild lilies clothed more gorgeously than Solomon; it was at Nazareth He had watched and learned how the corn is sown, and how it falls where the sower casts it, and which of it has the best chance of growing well. There He saw the weeds growing among the good grain, and saw the reapers at their glad work of harvesting. At Nazareth He watched the rain and the sun and learned from them lessons of God's impartial goodness. There He watched the fiery red sunsets and heard the farmers' prophecies of fine or foul weather. On the hillsides of Nazareth He learned the ways of shepherds, and how they cared for one lost sheep.

Was all this nothing for the growing up of Jesus, to be the one of all the world of men who has read most clearly God's handwriting in the open book of Nature? The country was surely an instrument in Jesus' education.

4. But what of His growing up in *knowledge of the world,* its great affairs—all the world of secular life, of old and current history, of politics—all that goes to make the necessary stock of a man's mind for his intelligent mixing in the world? Now here we cannot pretend that we can find much of certain fact to guide us. We may assume, of course, that Jesus, mixing with the men of Nazareth, talking with them in the market-place, came to know all such things as they knew. But this we may note: that Nazareth was a good place for getting knowledge of the world. Men did not learn by newspapers then. News flew from mouth to mouth along the roads. And Nazareth was near some of the great roads. The Emperor's armies and his couriers, merchants—the chief news carriers—pilgrims, adventurers, all passed beneath its hills. It was a place where a man could scarcely live and keep ignorant of what was passing in that great Roman world.

And when we read the words of Jesus that so often speak of kings and their servants, and armies and courts, we are striking on reflections of the things He had seen and spoken of and brooded over often in Nazareth. There in the little country town He had had rare chances of knowing much of the power and magnificence of that Roman Empire whose glory filled the earth. When He entered upon His life's work He was tempted by a vision of the kingdoms of the world and of possessing them for His own. He had learned at Nazareth to know what that meant.

All this was another real part of the equipment and preparation of Jesus to become the perfect Man. He learned to know the outstanding facts about the world He was to die to save.

5. But now we come to something even more important. The fifth element that we may distinguish in the education of Jesus is this: He was *nurtured in the religious tradition of the people of God.* He learned the Scriptures, so that in after days they were His armoury for attack and defence against evil spirits and evil men. 'It is written.' 'How readest thou?' His soul was nourished upon what Moses and all the prophets had written. He learned there what He was called to be—the suffering Saviour of His people and of the whole world. Those lessons in Scripture began at His mother's knee. And His earthly father doubtless took them up, as every true Jew did and still does for his boys. 'Thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children.' And then there was the Synagogue school, and the Synagogue worship. When He came back to Nazareth, as a prophet, only to be despised as one they knew there too well, we read, 'He came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and he entered the synagogue, as his custom was, on the sabbath day.' He had been there from boyhood. And then from twelve years old there had been those visits to Jerusalem for the Passover feast—the crowding thoughts and emotions of those visits, the eager questioning of the religious leaders of His loved people, the flooding sense that here, of all places on earth, was His Heavenly Father's home and His Heavenly Father's business. On that first visit it all crowded out for a time His thought of His earthly home and His parents. It was the boy, with a real boy's mind and heart, awaking to the near reality of God—God who had been coming to Him, arousing His own consciousness within Him, through all those earlier years when He had been learning line by line out of the book of His revelation and the fellowship of His Church.

So Jesus grew to perfect manhood nurtured in the religious tradition of His people—the people of God. The truth of God—which was the truth of His own inner being, as of none other who ever lived—dawned upon His consciousness and grew and grew to fulness. Jesus had an education in religion. Under it He developed in God-consciousness, till He became Himself the perfect revelation of God to men.

6. We must speak of one more, a sixth element that belonged to the conditions of Jesus' development. There came *a crisis, and a dedication.* In His now mature manhood a great religious movement shook the feeling and the conscience of the people among whom He lived, like a breeze stirring the waters of some lake out of stagnancy. John the Baptist arose with his trumpet call to repentance: and men's hearts were moved with fear and expectation.

Into the midst of that movement Jesus came forth. His hour had come. The summons had been heard to do the work for which He had been sent into the world. And it came through the voice of John calling to his baptism. Jesus went to be baptized of John. He must be with His people utterly in their turning to God when His prophet called. And there the seal was set upon all His preparation. The voice from heaven and the fluttering dove were signs of something that happened in His own soul. His work, the saving of a sinful world, was ready for Him, and He was ready for the work. Alone in the wilderness He went and fought His great battle of final renunciation of all that might hinder or prevent His firm following of the way of God. He came forth Conqueror, to live and die that He might bring the world to the Father.

With that crisis, that dedication made perfect through strength and victory, we may say that Jesus' education was complete.

It had been long—thirty years. It had been quiet: what had there been here that was not ordinary? The Apocryphal Gospels, written when the Church thirsted for unedifying marvels, told of miracles attending Jesus' childhood and youth. But they lied. The growing up of Jesus had been such as ours might be; only He was different from what we can ever be. Only through Him can we be like Him. It was for that He came, for that He lived, and died, and conquered.

We may do well to think more earnestly than we have perhaps often done about this story of Jesus' education; because these things, no less

than the rest in the wonderful story, are written for our example. As we think about our task and duty of leading the children into the company of the Lord, as we stand among all the baffling difficulties that seem to beset us when we attempt the task of helping the children to grow up as Christians indeed, some light may come to us from the story.

Take these things, these which we can be sure of, which went to the making of the perfect manhood of Jesus as its conditions, and does it not seem that they are all of them conditions which we ought to strive to put around the children whom we covet for Christ, as those through which they may most fitly and surely come to that manhood and womanhood which is the will of God for them in Christ Jesus?

That the children should have holy and happy homes, into which they are welcomed by the love of mothers and fathers who love God still more, where they are prayed for as earnestly as they are cared for, where they may learn glad obedience, and self-denying comradeship:

That the children should grow up to know the need and the delight of simple work; free from the curse of poverty, but free from the greater curse of luxury and idleness:

That the children should learn, by seeing, to love the beauty and order of the natural world that God has provided for their home, and read there the truths of His eternal government; and that, for this, they should be free to their share in fresh air and green fields:

That the children should have all chance of knowing, as best it can be taught them, the facts of the world's history and present needs as they are related to the part they have to play in its affairs; that they should all have full opportunity of the widest and wisest 'secular' education:

That the children should be nurtured in the religious tradition of the people of God; taught to know and love, with understanding, all that increasing revelation that God has given to His Church in trust—and to rejoice in the Church's worship and fellowship:

That the children should grow up to watch for and to grasp the hour of their opportunity when they may find a purpose and will of God for them to which they may dedicate their whole self:

These are principles of education which time does not change; they are foundation principles. And we may do something by prayer and labour to bring them to realization for all who are born into this world.

Entre Nous.

Hastings Rashdall.

It would have been difficult for any one person to deal adequately with the life of that outstanding figure among Modernists, Hastings Rashdall. The unity which is necessary to a well-written life has been excellently preserved in this case—*The Life of Hastings Rashdall, D.D.* (Milford; 18s. net)—by the giving of the work to a colleague of his own, Mr. P. E. Matheson, a Fellow of New College. His intimate knowledge of Rashdall's years at Oxford as student, and later as Tutor and Fellow, enables him to make these periods full of interest. But Mr. Matheson felt that to deal adequately with Rashdall's many-sidedness as historian, philosopher, and theologian, and to present an equally vivid picture of his time as Canon of Hereford and the last phase of his life as Dean of Carlisle, he must call in the help of others, and so the value of the life is enhanced by the chapters contributed by Professor C. C. J. Webb, by the present Canon of Hereford, the Venerable Archdeacon Lilley, by Chancellor Campbell of Carlisle, and by Mr. Summers, who was a Congregational minister in Carlisle from 1912 to 1921. The last gives an attractive picture of the relations which existed between the Dean and his Nonconformist brethren. He instituted a bimonthly fraternal, which was attended by ten Anglicans and ten Nonconformists.

Mr. Matheson's task was not made easier by the fact that the bulk of the letters to which he had access were those which Rashdall wrote to his mother. They covered practically the whole of his life, since she died as a very old lady only a short time before himself, and they are apt to contain lists of events, an account of his movements, rather than any statement of thought. Nor does he appear to have had that gift of lightness and humour

in letter-writing which made him such an excellent conversationalist.

Hastings Rashdall was born in 1858. He was named, by the wish of his grandmother Mrs. Rashdall, after her brother Mr. Hastings Bonner. He was the son of John Rashdall of whom Tennyson wrote : ' Early in 1852 my father and mother went on a visit to one of his old college friends, Mr. Rashdall, the clergyman of Malvern, and met the Carlyles and Sydney Dobell. Rashdall was a man so beloved by his parishioners and so simple and direct in his language from the pulpit that he had emptied the Dissenting Chapels for miles round.' As a child Rashdall showed a religious bent. ' Once the maid came to Mrs. Rashdall with a grave face, saying, " Master Hastings had been so long at his prayers, Ma'am, and I don't like to interrupt him." He loved to attend the daily services at St. Mark's, the district church, and, on one occasion, when a churching was to take place, and the clerk did not appear, the boy escaped from his nurse, knelt down by the woman, and repeated all the responses in a loud voice.' He was educated at Harrow. It is said that Dr. Butler, when asked whom he considered his most distinguished pupil, replied, ' It is not easy to say, but if you press me, I think—Rashdall.' From Harrow he went to New College, Oxford. When he left Oxford he carried away with him ' a strong bent for philosophical and theological study, and had laid the foundation for his principles in ethics and metaphysics.' For a short time he lectured at St. David's College, Lampeter, then followed a tutorship at University College, Durham. He was ordained in June 1884 by Bishop Westcott. We next find him back again at his beloved Alma Mater. This return was made possible by a fellowship at Hertford. At this time he instituted a society to discuss religious and philosophical questions. It was attended by, among others, Vernon Bartlet, Fairbairn, the present Dean of St. Paul's, the present Bishops of Carlisle, Manchester, and Pretoria, Percy Gardner, C. C. J. Webb, and B. H. Streeter. In 1894 he succeeded Canon Freemantle as Chaplain and Theological Fellow at Balliol. In 1895 he was appointed Fellow and Tutor of New College. To this period belongs the publication of the first of his three great books, ' The Universities of the Middle Ages.' ' The book contained a declaration of faith which went far beyond college life : it laid down the lines on which his later books, *The Theory of Good and Evil* and *The Atonement*, were to be written, and the policy which determined his whole attitude to religious questions and to the Church of England. The supreme value of personal teaching, the policy of spontaneous development and adaptation, the demand for intellectual freedom, the hatred of obscurantism, and the rejection of false claims of authority—these are the governing ideas of life which seem to emerge from the varied and fascinating pages.' He was an inspiring teacher, and entirely sincere and outspoken and full of enthusiasm. One pupil wrote that he ' did me the honour of holding forth at me alone for an hour, vehemently confuting all the heresies I had been advocating in my essays. He was determined that I should take the Kingdom of Heaven by storm, even vicariously by *his* violence, in spite of *my* perversity.' He felt himself that his position was not without difficulty. ' You see,' he said on one occasion, ' I am on the left wing of the Church and the right wing of the philosopher.'

' A girl student whom he had kindly consented to coach in philosophy, as she was the niece of a friend, records her delight in his lectures, especially those on Kant, and her terror at her coachings in his study ; how he would come in rather late, " at express speed," and put a question and walk round the study, inspecting his bookshelves or winding the clock while he waited for the answer from his nervous pupil, and how he overcame her shyness at lunch or tea with stories of Jowett and other notabilities ; and how, when she apologized for her stupidity on some occasion, he replied, " I assure you I notice nothing out of the ordinary." '

He is stated at this time—1895—to be ' a figure rather below the middle height, grave thoughtful eyes with shaggy eyebrows, and set in a large head with a massive brow rising into a domelike top. The face in repose, as in all the portraits, was grave and sometimes sad, but was at once lit up with merriment and brightness by any stroke of humour. As time went on his hair grew rapidly thinner, and his colleagues watched with interest the care with which his last remaining lock was trained over his baldness.' An interesting pen portrait by Mr. W. J. Barton, a Winchester scholar, who visited Italy with him, begins in this way : ' I had known him fairly well for six months, for we lived on the same stair. As undergraduates will, I had regarded him half as a joke. It was only on this journey that I learnt he was a great man. There was plenty to smile at still, but all my thoughts of him were afterwards coloured by my discovery of his deep piety. In Paris, Florence, Milan, he would never miss Sunday Communion and Matins, though we always ran, and were late. I was astonished at the length and intensity of his morning and evening

55 566

prayers, and then first appreciated his regard for institutional Christianity.'

In 1910 he was appointed to a Canonry at Hereford, and the Venerable Archdeacon Lilley writes: 'It is hardly necessary to say how we felt, and I think delighted in, the bigness of the man at our Chapter meetings. The business of a Cathedral Chapter is never very exciting, and much of it is necessarily a matter of routine. But even in the veriest matter of routine principle may be involved, sometimes deeply involved. And Rashdall was a man of principle. Nothing offended him so much as intellectual slovenliness. He would sit silent, indrawn rather than withdrawn, through a long discussion only to startle us with a sudden intervention, it might be only a pointed question, which lifted some matter that had seemed to us one of mere custom or expediency on to the higher ground of principle. Rashdall was of course an intellectualist, but his intellectualism had always moral roots.'

In 1917 he entered upon the last phase, being appointed Dean of Carlisle in that year.

A gloom was cast on the last years by a storm of criticism aroused by an address which he gave at Girton on Christ as Logos and Son of God. The position that he took up was that Christ had not claimed Divinity for Himself, but he was reported as having denied the Divinity of Christ. His exact position with regard to the doctrines of the Incarnation, the Atonement, and the Trinity, he made abundantly clear in his Bampton Lectures, 'The Idea of Atonement in Christian Theology,' and in his massive work in two volumes on 'The Theory of Good and Evil.' It is not possible here to summarize these. It might, however, be noted that a volume of *Ideas and Ideals*, compiled from the Dean's literary remains, has been issued by Mr. Basil Blackwell at the modest price of 6s. net. One of these essays contains a clear though brief statement of his position with regard to the Atonement, and another, 'The Scholastic Theology,' of his doctrine of the Trinity.

'A True Christian.'

'The Deanery was a centre of intellectual and spiritual life for the city and neighbourhood. From it went out kind thoughts and deeds for all who were in trouble or need, without distinction of persons. "Why," said some one in the street in the time of the attack on him, "you have only to watch the man's life to know he is a true Christian."

'A verger was heard to say: "When my son came home wounded from France the Dean was one of the first to call and see him. He sat down in my cottage and smoked a cigarette with us, just as if he was anybody at all." The evidence of his friendship with the poor is abundant. One friend wrote after his death: "One of the very poor said to me two or three years ago, 'Oh, miss, you don't know what he's done. He's brought Christ and Christ's ways to the door of the working man here.'" Another friend records how the Dean would cycle out to country churches in Cumberland to take services for clergy who could not afford a substitute. And the courage with which he went on with his work amid the terrible pain and discomfort of his illness was a lesson to all. His slips of absent-mindedness made him the dearer. "Oh, never mind," said a verger, "his feet are on the ground, his head is in the sky, but his heart is in the right place."'[1]

The next number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES starts a new volume. Articles of special interest have been arranged. The series on leaders of religious thought will include an account of Archbishop Söderblom, by Professor M. Tor Andrae of Upsala; of Wilfred Monod, by Pastor A. N. Bertrand of Paris, in collaboration with Professor Merle d' Aubigné; of Deissmann, by Professor Curtis, Edinburgh; of Loofs, by Professor Hugh Watt, Edinburgh; of Father Tyrrell, by Mr. Will Spens. Articles on the Gospel for India, dealing with Indian receptivity in respect of Christian teaching on the Incarnation, Salvation, Knowledge of God, Attitude to Life and Immortality, are to be contributed by Principal W. S. Urquhart. Canon A. E. J. Rawlinson's 'Recent Work on the Life of Jesus' will also appear shortly, and a new series of articles will appear on 'Books that have left their mark on our Epoch.' Fuller announcements will be made later.

The editors are open to receive not only articles but also contributions for 'Virginibus Puerisque.' All such contributions should be sent direct to Kings Gate, Aberdeen.

[1] P. E. Matheson, *The Life of Hastings Rashdall, D.D.*, 238.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

1-3.50

FOR REFERENCE
Do Not Take From This Room
DEMCO
UNITED THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY